OLD TESTAMENT ESSAYS

221.082
S678

LONDON
CHARLES GRIFFIN AND COMPANY, LIMITED
42 DRURY LANE, W.C. 2

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

OLD TESTAMENT ESSAYS

PAPERS READ BEFORE THE SOCIETY FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY AT ITS EIGHTEENTH MEETING, HELD AT KEBLE COLLEGE, OXFORD, SEPTEMBER 27TH TO 30TH, 1927.

LONDON
CHARLES GRIFFIN AND COMPANY, LIMITED
42 DRURY LANE, W.C. 2
[*All rights reserved*]
1927

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66102

Printed in Great Britain
by Bell & Bain, Limited, Glasgow.

221.082
S678

FOREWORD.

THE Society of Old Testament Study was founded in January, 1917, in order to assist in promoting and co-ordinating Old Testament Study. This object it has attempted to achieve in the past in a variety of ways—by holding two meetings each year, by assisting financially and otherwise the publication of a number of useful books intended for the general public, as well as by encouraging work of a more specialized nature.

For some years the Society has felt the need of closer co-operation between Old Testament students of different nationalities, since no existing Society attempts this—the need was not met even by the Oriental Congresses of pre-war days. The Society, therefore, invited Old Testament Scholars of every country to a special meeting held in Oxford in September of this year. The response to the invitation was very gratifying, for representative Scholars from America, Denmark, France, Germany, Holland, Lithuania, Czecho-Slovakia, and Russia expressed their willingness to co-operate with members of the Society for Old Testament Study. The various Sessions were attended by nearly a hundred specialists in this field of knowledge, and it is to be hoped that so remarkable a gathering is but the precursor of many future meetings of a similar character.

But, apart from the international significance of the meeting, the papers and essays in themselves constituted a contribution to Old Testament Study of no inconsiderable

51134

merit. The Society, therefore, decided to publish them *in extenso*, even though it was found impossible to include in the volume any report of contributions, sometimes equal in value to the papers themselves, which were made during the course of the discussion which followed the reading of each.

It falls to my lot to thank all those who contributed to the success of the meeting by preparing and reading papers, as well as those whose co-operation in other ways ensured the success of the enterprise, and also the Authorities of Keble College, who entertained the Society within its walls.

I cannot, however, close this brief Foreword without referring to two whose inspiration and enthusiasm have largely been responsible for the success of this meeting. One of them, Professor Hugo Gressmann, who so much endeared himself to all who met him when he lectured for me in Oxford two years ago, was not spared to see the realisation of a project which he had so much at heart—namely, the co-operation of English-speaking and Continental scholars. The other is still with us, and is President elect of the Society for next year, Professor T. H. Robinson, of Cardiff, to whose energy the Society owed its formation, and without whose self-denying labours during the last two years it would have been impossible to organise the international gathering which met in Oxford this year. To him as Secretary, not to myself as President, has fallen the preliminary work in connection with the publication of this volume, as well as the responsibility of seeing it through the Press.

D. C. SIMPSON.

Oriel College, Oxford,
Oct. 31, 1927.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

FOREWORD, - - - - - - - - - iii
Rev. D. C. Simpson, D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Rochester.

I. PROPHETIC SYMBOLISM, - - - - - - 1
Rev. H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D., Principal of Regent's Park College, London.

II. THE ORIGINAL FORM OF THE TETRAGRAMMATON, - - - - - - - 18
G. R. Driver, M.A., M.C., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.

III. THE TREE OF LIFE IN EDEN, - - - - 25
H. Th. Obbink, Professor Ordinarius in the History of Religion at the State University of Utrecht.

IV. DER GOTT DES MOSE, - - - - - - 29
D. Paul Volz, Professor des Alten Testaments, Tübingen.

V. THE PARADISE STORY OF EZEKIEL XXVIII., 37
Rev. G. A. Cooke, D.D., Hon. D.D. Edinburgh, Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

VI. DER FRÖMMIGKEITSTYPUS DER ALTTESTAMENTLICHEN RELIGION, - - - - - - 46
D. Dr. J. Hempel, Professor für das Alte Testament an der hiesigen Universität; Herausgeber der *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

PAGE

VII. Du rôle des Idées Magiques dans la Mentalité Israélite, - - - - 55
A. Lods, Professor à la Faculté des Lettres à l'Université de Paris.

VIII. Deuteronomy, - - - - - - - 77
B. D. Eerdmans, Professor of Hebrew in the University of Leiden.

IX. The Smallest Literary Unit in the Narrative Books of the Old Testament, - - - - - - - 85
D. Dr. Otto Eissfeldt, ord. Professor der Theologie (alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft) an der Universität Halle, Wittenberg.

X. Some Remarks on the Historical Grammar of the Hebrew Language, by Bauer and Leander (Halle, 1922), - - - 94
Professor A. A. Bevan, M.A., F.B.A., Lord Almoner's Reader in Arabic, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

XI. Archæology and the Religion of Israel, 99
S. A. Cook, D.Litt., Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, University Lecturer in Hebrew and Aramaic, Cambridge.

XII. Le Développement de la Diaspora Juive au V^e^ Siècle, - - - - - - 109
A. Causse, Professor d'Histoire des Religions et d' Ancien Testament à la Faculté de Théologie protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg.

XIII. The Poetry of the Psalms: Its Literary History and its application to the Dating of the Psalms, - - - 118
D. Dr. Hermann Gunkel, ord. Professor em. an der Universität Halle, Wittenberg, Honorary Member of the Society of Biblical Literature, New York.

PAGE

XIV. Die Gebete der Angeklagten im Alten Testament, - - - - - - - - 143
D. Hans. Schmidt, o. Professor der Theologie an der Hessischen Ludwigs-Universtät in Giessen.

XV. Israel and its Religious Environment, - 156
Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, M.A., D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, King's College, University of London.

XVI. The Syntax and Significance of Genesis i. 1-3, - - - - - - - - 163
J. M. Powis Smith, Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Languages and Literatures in the University of Chicago.

Programme of the Summer Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study, held at Keble College, Oxford, September 27 to 30, 1927, - - - 172

CORRIGENDA.

The Secretary of the Society regrets that, through an oversight for which neither the contributors nor the publishers are responsible, a number of misprints have been allowed to remain. Of these the most important are the following:—

Page v, line 3 from bottom, *for* hiesigen Universität *read* Universität Greifswald.

Page 2, note 5, for *The Golden Bough*, 21, read *The Golden Bough*^{2}, i.

Page 14, note 3, for *Les Élémentaires* read *Les Formes Élémentaires*.

Page 29, line 24, *for* Vertreten *read* Vertretern.

Page 48, lines 3 and 4, *delete* -

Page 49, line 15, *for* ach *read* auch.

Page 57, note 1, *for* Genthner *read* Geuthner.

Page 60, note 2, *for* Genneys *read* Gennep.

Page 80, line 8 from bottom, *for* 2*d read* 28.

Page 94, line 12, for *Orientalischer* read *Orientalistische;* line 15, for *der der* read *der*.

Page 96, line 11 from bottom, *for* Pagnon *read* Pognon.

Page 99, line 7, *delete* (i).

Page 102, line 13, *for* Aunki *read* Anuki.

Page 103, line 24, *delete* — *before* represent.

Page 104, line 3, *for* Hall *read* Hill; line 9, *for the read* the.

Page 105, line 6, *for* explorated *read* explored; line 22, *for* magi *read* magic.

Page 107, line 15, *for* and *read* an.

Page 108, line 5, *for* in factors *read* in supreme factors.

Page 109, note 1, for *religieuse* read *religieuses*.

Page 145, line 10, *for* Geschädigte *read* Geschädigter.

Page 158, line 13, *for* body *read* the body.

PROPHETIC SYMBOLISM.

Jews seek for signs, as one of them has said, and in this they are true to their Semitic origin. C. M. Doughty, in his *Arabia Deserta*,[1] records of a messenger sent to entrust him to the care of the sheykh of an Arab settlement that "taking off his kerchief-cord, he bound the sheykh's neck with it, saying that such was the bidding of Mohammed Aly, and that he bound him surety to answer for me." Doughty makes a comment on this act which will introduce the subject of this paper—"The Semitic life," he says, "is full of significant gestures and sacramental signs." We are often content to explain these acts from the general character of the Semite, and particularly from his concrete and individualizing imagination, which leads him to translate the thought into the deed, as well as into the spoken word. But before we accept so easy an explanation of the symbolic acts of the Hebrew prophets, we should take account of the naive realism which underlies so many ancient or primitive usages. The hospitality of the desert, for example, and the protection it affords, are well known; to share food with another is to make peace with him for two nights and the day in the midst. It is not always realized that this precise period is fixed, not by the convenience of the guest, but by the time that that particular food is supposed to be in his bowels.[2]

Ahijah the Shilonite will illustrate the kind of act with which we are here concerned.[3] Before he announces the division of the kingdom of Jeroboam, he tears into twelve portions the new mantle apparently assumed for the

[1] I., p. 140; *cf.* Acts xxi. 11 (Agabus binds his own hands and feet with Paul's girdle to confirm his approaching captivity).

[2] O. c., I. 228.

[3] I. Kings xi. 29ff. For magical ideas about clothing, see Jirku, ZAW 1917/8, p. 112.

purpose, and gives ten of these to the destined king of the northern tribes. Was that act simply an Oriental duplication of the word that followed it, or had it some deeper meaning? The aim of this paper is to examine such acts as these, when ascribed to a prophet as part of his mission, to consider how far they were actually performed, and with what object, and to indicate their contribution to our knowledge of the prophetic consciousness. The argument here presented is that such acts were really performed, and that they take an intermediate place between the imitative magic of primitive peoples and the sacramentalism of the New Testament, to the understanding of which they may be held to contribute.

So far as the *forms* of prophetic symbolism go, there can be no question about its resemblance to mimetic magic. Moses brings on the Egyptian plague of boils by throwing up handfuls of furnace-soot;[1] Muhammed, at the Battle of Badr, flings a handful of pebbles against an enemy three times his own men in number, apparently representing the promised angelic helpers.[2] When Israel fought with Amalek, the tide of victory flowed or ebbed according as Moses lifted or lowered the wonder-working staff;[3] whilst Ai was being captured and put under the ban, Joshua kept his javelin outstretched against it;[4] whilst the Tshi-speaking warriors of Africa are on the war-path, their wives keep up a mimic battle, to help their husbands.[5] The familiar principle here illustrated, whether within or without the Old Testament, is that "like produces like," and that an act performed in one place may be causally reproduced in another, by what Frazer called "savage telepathy." So "Zedekiah ben Chenaanah made him horns of iron and said (to Ahab), Thus saith Yahweh, With these shalt thou push the Syrians, until they be consumed."[6] Whether or not, as Hölscher suggests, the prophet here identifies himself with the bull-god pushing with his horns, it seems clear that there is an element of mimetic magic, though this is transformed from magic into religion by the

[1] Ex. ix. 8ff. [2] Kur'an viii. 9, 17; the throwing is ascribed to Allah.
[3] Ex. xvii. 8ff. [4] Josh. viii. 18, 26.
[5] Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, 21, 33. [6] I. Kings xxii. 11.

reference to Yahweh. In the prophetic consciousness the principle of "like produces like" becomes, as Ezekiel states it after one of his mimetic acts, "I am your portent (*mopheth*); like as I have done, so shall it be done unto them." [1] We cannot explain the act of a Zedekiah simply as a concrete figure of speech. The deliberate solemnity of it implies that it is considered to do something, and to make a real difference. If we doubt this, or put it aside as after all the act of a "false" prophet, we shall find a very similar act recorded of a "true" prophet of the highest spirituality—viz., Jeremiah. He is divinely ordered to make and wear a wooden yoke to represent the subjugation of the nations of Babylon. That he really does this is proved by the subsequent narrative, for the optimistic rival prophet, Hananiah, publicly removes and breaks this yoke to represent an early deliverance from Babylon. In reply to this challenge, Jeremiah is told to replace the broken wood by iron.[2]

An instructive example of early realistic symbolism is afforded by the visit of Joash to the dying Elisha. The king is told to arm himself with bow and arrows and to shoot eastwards, whilst the prophet's hand rests on his. The prophet's mouth meanwhile declares this to be Yahweh's arrow of victory against the Syrians. A further more specific omen is found in the number of times the king strikes the

[1] Ezek. xii. 11. Note on the Biblical use of the terms *'oth* and *mopheth*. The term *'oth* occurs 79 times in the O.T., and *mopheth* 36 times. As applied to events, both cover similar or the same ground, as denoting the symbolic act of a prophet, or his confirming sign, or a portent drawn from the heavenly bodies, or the fulfilment of a divine penalty. The term *mopheth* applies to events only, and not to objects; the term *'oth* applies also to objects, as its etymology suggests, such as a standard, a scarlet cord, a stone, a tribal mark, also to a rite or usage (circumcision and the Sabbath), to which some special significance is given. The difference is brought out by comparing *'oth* used of the sun as the "sign" of a sacred season with *mopheth* used of its eclipse (Gen. i. 14, Joel ii. 30 (iii. 3)). The event designated as *'oth* may be quite ordinary, such as Saul's meeting with the band of prophets (I. Sam. x. 7, 9), though special significance is given to the "coincidence" (*cf.* I. Sam. xiv. 10). The *mopheth* further suggests the extraordinary nature of the event, usually connected with *calamity* (*cf.* its probable Arabic cognate). As applied to the symbolic act of a prophet, the *'oth* designates it simply as a sign which signifies something beyond itself; the *mopheth* adds the suggestion of warning, though this seems to have been lost in the later usage (*cf.* II. Chron. xxxii. 24, 31, with II. Kings xx. 8, 9, the later writer substituting *mopheth* for the earlier *'oth*). The most frequent use of both terms, often in combination, is, however, in regard to the "plagues" of Egypt.

[2] Jer. xxvii. 2ff; xxviii. 10, 13.

ground with the bundle of arrows, at the bidding of Elisha. The prophet is angry because the king strikes the ground three times only; had he struck five or six times, the victories would have been as many. Through the king's lack of energy on this occasion, he is said to have subsequently defeated the Syrians three times only.

In other instances among the earlier prophets the symbolism, though real, is less obvious. Thus Elisha, after lying on the corpse of the Shunammite's son till he has warmed it, rises to walk backwards and forwards in the house, and then returns to his task of physical contact.[1] A rationalistic exegete might say that he was cramped; but it is much more likely that by walking about he was simulating the action of a living child. Similarly, in ancient India, when a man wrongly supposed to be dead returned to his family he had to spend the first night in a tub silent and with doubled-up fists like a newborn child.[2] Another example of simulation is, I think, to be found in the attitude of Elijah on the peak of Carmel, whilst waiting for the drought to break. He is said to have crouched on the ground with his face between his knees, and he continues in this position until a small cloud is reported.[3] It looks as though he were "rain-making" by simulating the wished-for cloud, just as do the Australian aborigines who squat and then make efforts to rise like a cloud.[4] As Frazer remarks, "the performers definitely assimilate themselves to the celestial or atmospheric phenomena which they seek to produce."[5] The subsequent running of Elijah before Ahab's chariot for many miles, the hand of Yahweh being upon him, may possibly be a further simulation of the rainstorm sweeping through the valley of Jezreel.[6] Another example of a prophetic act influencing the subsequent course of events also concerns Ahab, after his treaty with Benhadad.[7] An unnamed prophet is sent to denounce this misplaced clemency, and does it by the fictitious story

[1] II. Kings iv. 35. We may compare the miracle of making an iron axe-head swim, by throwing a stick of wood into the water where it had sunk (II. Kings vi. 6).

[2] Frazer, *op. cit.*, i. 22. [3] I. Kings xviii. 42.

[4] Spencer and Gillen, *Northern Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 285.

[5] Frazer, *op. cit.*, i. 90. [6] I. Kings xviii. 46. [7] I. Kings xx. 35ff.

of an escaped prisoner for whom he himself was responsible. But the prophet has deliberately got himself wounded, as though mishandled by the angry man to whom he was responsible. This could hardly have been to make his tale more plausible ; it is done "by the word of Yahweh," which implies that he is laying a divine penalty on Ahab's carelessness by his own suffering. We see again how very seriously these acts were taken by the prophet himself. Their *forms* are an inheritance from the past ; their *meaning* is transformed by being taken up into the prophetic religion, with its far higher outlook.

One of the most notable of these acts was performed by Isaiah, who for three years before the capture of Ashdod in 711 went about Jerusalem without his sandals and his outer garment, by this representing the state of a captive slave, as depicted on the Assyrian monuments. This was to be the fate of the human helpers, the Egyptians and the Ethiopians, on whom Judah was relying.[1] We cannot explain this long representation as a dramatic gesture only, or as a device to arouse curiosity ; it is said to be a divinely ordered sign and portent (*'oth* and *mopheth*). The spoken word of a prophet was conceived to be an objective instrument of the divine will, operating as it were automatically ; how much more, then, the acted word, with its greater intensity of realism ? The spoken word amongst the Semites could gain an intrinsic power, as something let loose and not to be recalled, as we know from the Hebrew attitude towards blessings and curses ; the objectivity of this word is well illustrated in an Arab's curse of those about to kill him ; one of these threw his young son flat on the ground, that the curse might fly over him, without hurting him.[2] If a human word could, on occasion, be charged with such power, how much more the divine word, through a prophet's mouth ? It was by the word of Yahweh that the heavens were created ; His word would not return to Him void, but would run swiftly to accomplish His will, acting like a fire or like a hammer that breaks the rocks in pieces, falling on a people when once despatched

[1] Is. xx. ; *cf.* Micah i. 8.
[2] Wellhausen, *Reste Arabischen Heidentums*, [2], p. 139, n. 4.

on its mission, and slaying them.[1] To this conception there are many Babylonian parallels ; as Professor Langdon says, " The Sumerians and consequently the Semites regarded a formally spoken ' word,' containing the force of a command or promise, as a definite and real thing. It possessed magical and terrible power if it issued from a deity, from a priest, or from a human being under formal circumstances." [2] It seems, therefore, that we must conceive the prophetic symbolism of the Hebrews, so essentially linked to the spoken word of the prophets, as possessing similar objectivity and intrinsic power, but to an even greater degree. If so, Isaiah would be conscious that his captive garb was helping to bring about the event he foretold.[3] It was not magic, for it was not coercive of Yahweh ; it was religion, the religious act of one whose consciousness was made the vehicle of the divine will. But the act on the higher level of religion is formally akin to the act on the lower level of magic, the level at which a Cambodian hunter will pretend to tumble accidentally into his own net as an inducement to the game he hunts to go and do likewise.[4]

The yoke carried by Jeremiah to represent subjugation to Babylon has already been mentioned ; other acts of similar kind are recorded of him. One of these is the formal breaking of an earthware flask at " the gate of potsherds," to represent the breaking of Judah and Jerusalem.[5] This is done in the presence of chosen witnesses *prior* to the public announcement of the doom in the temple courts ; the order of events shows that the act was not intended to be an illustration of the message, but rather an instrument of its fulfilment, something which had to be done first in order that the word to be proclaimed might be fully efficacious. Isaiah had used the figure of the breaking of Jerusalem as a potter's vessel is broken ; [6] Jeremiah makes that figure into an effective act. In the same way, when

[1] Ps. xxxiii. 6, *cf.* Gen. i. 3 ; Is. lv. 11, Ps. cxlvii. 15, Jer. xxiii. 29, Is. ix. 8 (9), Hos. vi. 5.

[2] *Ency. Religion and Ethics*, xii., p. 749.

[3] So. Pedersen, *Israel*, p. 169, " there is an indissoluble connection between the individual case and the whole. . . . The signs or tokens are realities."

[4] Frazer, *op. cit.*, i. 24. [5] xix. 1ff. [6] Is. xxx. 14.

Jeremiah is carried against his will into Egypt, he buries stones before a frontier building, on which Nebuchadrezzar shall later on erect his throne ;[1] again, Jeremiah sends a written curse to be thrown into the Euphrates, to symbolize the future sinking of Babylon.[2] The account of the buried loin-cloth is more open to dispute as to its precise nature. The prophet is told to buy and wear a linen loin-cloth, then to go and bury it by Euphrates, then, after many days, to go and dig up the spoiled linen.[3] This represents Yahweh taking His people into intimate association with Himself, their alienation from Him, and their consequent destruction. The chief difficulty felt here is the improbability of an actual double journey to the distant Euphrates for such a purpose ; it has been suggested that the Hebrew word for "Euphrates"—viz., *Perath*—really stands for Parah, near the prophet's home. The resemblance of the names would probably be regarded as a sufficient ground for taking this water rather than another as representative of the Euphrates. We must also remember that on any view of these symbolic acts, they spring from some vision or audition, and that some of the features of the events within the prophet's consciousness can be passed on only as interpretations or comments on the act. But it does not seem necessary with Professor Volz to regard the whole incident as a dialogue between the prophet and Yahweh put into narrative form.[4] The wearing of the loin-cloth is as possible, as natural, and as suggestive as the symbolic act of Isaiah.

One other symbolic act of Jeremiah's shows the manner in which the objective deed and the subjective interpretation of it must have blended with each other within the prophetic consciousness. This was his purchase with due legal formalities of a family estate at Anathoth while it was still in the power of the Babylonian besiegers.[5] Here we find first a foreboding that his cousin would come to offer him the property, then the actual coming of Hanamel,

[1] Jer. xliii. 8. [2] li. 63, 64. [3] xiii. 1-11.

[4] *Der Prophet Jeremia*, pp. 147ff., where it is urged that xiii. 1, 3, 8 imply a message to the prophet, but not a public act. But it is not easy to put aside the circumstantiality of the narrative, which is very different from xxv. 17, admittedly a vision. No use of the journey to the Euphrates is made in the explanation, and the symbol is intelligible without it.

[5] xxxii. 7.

next the recognition or confirmation of the divine purpose to be accomplished symbolically in the purchase, and finally a further confirmation and interpretation of the act within his own mind. This gradual emergence of the divine message reminds us of the delay of ten days in the desired oracle about going to Egypt,[1] and suggests the gradual and piece-meal fashion in which a photographic image comes out on a plate in the developing tray. The incident of the Anathoth purchase throws some light on the much-disputed question of Hosea's marriage to Gomer,[2] for it shows, not only that a prophet might regard his wife's infidelity subsequent to marriage as part of the providential order of his life, but also that he might identify his own subsequent interpretation of the infidelity with the marriage-consciousness itself—just as Isaiah reads back his later experience into the interpretation of his temple-vision.[3] Thus it would be natural for Hosea, foreshortening his retrospective view, to ascribe the original impulse to marry Gomer to a divine message, "Go take unto thee a wife of whoredom and children of whoredom"—for that was how it ultimately worked out. The marriage becomes an act of prophetic symbolism, though the prophet was at first unconscious of this aspect of it, just as Jeremiah was at first unconscious of the prophetic symbolism of the Anathoth-purchase. We find another example of this intimate mingling of an event with its interpretation in connection with the death of Ezekiel's wife. Here, however, the emphasis falls on the prophet's abstinence from the usual mourning rites to represent the stupefied grief of the people when they hear of the fall of Jerusalem.[4] The independent event is here consciously modified to make it suitably symbolic—though, of course, for the prophet no events were independent of the will of Yahweh. In the same way, we may conjecture that Ezekiel's "dumbness" may have been due originally to physical conditions, such as partial catalepsy, with intermittent aphasia,[5] and that he interpreted this as a divinely ordered and significant feature in his prophetic work. All these are interesting

[1] xlii. 7. [2] Hos. i. and iii. [3] Is. vi.
[4] Ezek. xxiv. 15ff. [5] iii. 14, 26; *cf.* Bertholet, *ad loc.*

examples of the power of the human spirit to transform the meaning of so-called "facts," a power exercised by all, but especially operative in the prophetic consciousness.

There are other symbolic acts ascribed to Ezekiel which seem to us so artificial and unnecessary that their real occurrence has often been disputed. He is said to have enacted the siege of Jerusalem as naively as a child might have done—by drawing a plan of the city on a clay tablet, and making siege works in miniature around it; then the prophet, on the other side of an iron plate, stretched out an arm bared for action like a warrior's, to represent the angry Yahweh.[1] This was physically possible; but it was hardly possible for him to lie on his left side for 190 days (according to the LXX) to represent Israel's 190 years of captivity, and 40 days on his right side to represent Judah's 40 years of captivity, whilst eating scanty and unclean food.[2] In any case, as with Jeremiah's alleged journey to the Euphrates, we must suppose that the interpretation is here mingled with the narrative of events. Further, Ezekiel cuts off his own hair and beard with a sharp sword as razor and dramatically represents the differing fortunes of the people by the way he treats the three portions of this hair.[3] At another time he deposits his goods outside his house, breaks through the wall of it, and carries his baggage away with covered face, to represent the escape of the fugitives from Jerusalem, and the fate of the king; he eats bread and drinks water with visible haste and alarm, to represent the terror of the besieged or the fugitives.[4] At a still later time he takes two wooden sticks on which he writes respectively "Judah's" and "Joseph's," and then joins them together to represent the future reunion of the divided kingdoms.[5] All these acts suggest the "make-believe" of a child, which is perhaps why some interpreters of Ezekiel have hesitated to regard them as more than figures of speech. But the prophets were able to enter their kingdom just because in some respects they *were* children, and could take the "make-believe" so seriously. Through these trivialities (as we call them)

[1] iv. 1ff. [2] iv. 4ff. [3] v. 1-4.
[4] xii. 1-20. [5] xxxvii. 15ff.; *cf.* Zech. xi.

they were conscious of exerting a power over outer events, just as the child is conscious of power through its "make-believe." Necessarily excluded to some degree from the world of "grown-ups," the child creates a world of its own, intensely real, into which they can hardly enter. If to an intensity like this we add the profound conviction of the Hebrew prophet that Yahweh was using his servant's mouth or hand for these words and deeds, and that they counted for something in the new order which Yahweh was creating, we shall be nearer to the understanding of the symbolic acts of Ezekiel and the rest. They are not simply dramatic illustrations of a rather feeble kind; they are partial realizations of that which is to come, and to its coming they themselves will contribute in their own degree. Their complete fulfilment may bring the greatest grief to the prophet, as it did to Jeremiah; yet it is the will of Yahweh, and he must both declare and further that will by every means in his power. His acts are in some degree magical in form and origin; but their character has been transformed by their being taken up into the will of Yahweh, to which the prophet has so fully surrendered his own will. This surrender is vividly expressed by Ezekiel in a visionary or ecstatic experience, doubtless indistinguishable by him from the external event—he was given a roll to eat, on which the woes to come were written, and it was in his mouth as honey for sweetness—because it was Yahweh's will—though the prophet must go in bitterness when the hand of Yahweh was upon him.[1]

However difficult it may be for us, with our very different outlook on life and religion, to define the precise character of the prophetic "realism" which has been indicated, we must at least expect to find that it involves conceptions remote from our own. In the study of ancient documents it is usually safe to assume that whatever be the explanation

[1] ii. 9—iii. 3; iii. 14. Subsequent to Ezekiel the only examples of prophetic symbolism are those recorded of Zechariah. He took gold and silver contributed from Babylon, and made a crown to put on the head of Zerubbabel (see Commentaries for emendation of text), who is to be the Messianic ruler. The crown is preserved in the temple as a memorial of those who have given its substance—showing that this was not conceived as a real coronation, but only a symbolic anticipation of it (Zech. vi. 9ff.). The "men of a portent" in iii. 8 are noticed later on in this paper.

of the events they describe, it will not be that most natural to ourselves. This applies, of course, to many other examples of "realism" to be found in the life of Israel. Hezekiah took the insolent letter of the Assyrian commander into the temple, and spread it out before Yahweh, praying him to open His eyes and see it.[1] Judas Maccabaeus and his followers, when fasting at Mizpeh, "spread out the roll of the Law (one of those), concerning which the Gentiles were wont to make search in order to depict upon them likenesses of their idols."[2] The custom of placing the foot on the neck of captives was a realistic way of confirming the supremacy gained in battle.[3] The drawing off of the shoe in connection with the transfer of property originally belonged to the same order of thought, as did the passing between the parts of a divided covenant sacrifice.[4] Syrian "realism" may be illustrated by the request of Naaman for two mules' burden of Israelite soil, on which to worship the God of Israel outside Israel's territory.[5] It is agreed that the pictures found in Egyptian tombs objectify the articles required by the dead man in his life beyond death.[6] The stones cast at certain places by Moslem pilgrims are believed to testify at the resurrection that the pilgrimage has been fulfilled.[7] Such examples, which might be multiplied to almost any extent, are sufficient to remind us that we are dealing with an order of thought different from our own, and that our instinctive explanations are as likely to be wrong as the popular belief that the covering up of human excrement proves Moses to have been an advanced authority in sanitation.[8] Just as Hebrew psychology ascribed psychical qualities to the physical organs and made the body an essential part of human personality, so Hebrew philosophy (if the term may be allowed) ascribed metaphysical significance to events in the external world, and made them (as symbols) parts of a larger whole of reality. A special example of this, both within and without

[1] II. Kings xix. 14ff.; Is. xxxvii. 14ff.
[2] I. Macc. iii. 48. [3] Josh. x. 24.
[4] Ruth iv. 7, Ps. lx. 8 (10), *cf.* Deut. xxv. 9; Jer. xxxiv. 18, Gen. xv. 17.
[5] II. Kings v. 17.
[6] Notscher, *Altorientalischer und alttestamentlicher Auferstehungsglauben*, p. 37.
[7] Doughty, *op. cit.*, II. p. 538. [8] Deut. xxiii. 13.

Hebrew prophecy, may be seen in the significance of Hebrew proper names, as perhaps also in the frequent use of paronomasia. The naming of a child, as by Isaiah or Hosea, was a real event, and as such could be thought to influence other real events. We are apt to go astray in our interpretation of such things, because we start from an implicit dualism between the material and the spiritual. But the world in which the Israelite, and therefore the prophets of Israel, lived was one in which this dualism did not exist, for the spiritual was constantly affecting the material and the material the spiritual, and all lay in Yahweh's hand. *Their* antithesis was not that of mind and matter, but of God and man. As Professor Bertholet has rightly said,[1] "the interaction of divine power and human insufficiency may be justly named the thesis of the history of Israel's religion."

It will be seen, therefore, that any theory of prophetic symbolism which fails to do justice to its realistic element must be rejected. One such theory which seems to me inadequate on this and other grounds would make the accounts of these acts simply a form of literary expression, implying no actual performance of them. Appeal is made,[2] not only to the alleged extravagance or triviality of some of these acts, but also to such a passage as that in which Jeremiah speaks of the cup of the wrath of Yahweh, which he is bidden to take from Yahweh's hand and give to the nations to make them drunk.[3] The prophet adds, "Then took I the cup at Yahweh's hand, and made all the nations to drink." The drinking of the cup is obviously a figure of the Babylonian victories over the nations named; it no more implies or allows the presence of a material cup than does the cry of Gethsemane. In the vision that lies behind this prophecy, Jeremiah saw a cup as with his eyes of flesh, and doubtless saw himself as the cup-bearer to the doomed guests at Yahweh's banquet.[4] When he utters the divine word to the nations, he proclaims an experience which will be as the drinking of that cup; it is natural

[1] *Das Dynamistische im Alten Testament*, p. 43.

[2] So Gressmann, shortly before his lamented death, in a personal discussion of this subject with the writer.

[3] Jer. xxv. 15-17; *cf.* Ps. lxxv. 8 (9). [4] Zeph, i. 7.

enough that he should characterize his prophecy in the figure drawn from his vision, a figure familiar in the literature, though there is no symbolic act in this instance corresponding with it. In other instances, as in that of the buried loin-cloth, there is legitimate room for debate how far the visionary experience is visibly re-enacted or simply reported; probably the prophet could have drawn no hard and fast line between the psychical and the physical in his experience, even if he distinguished them at all. But in yet other instances, the enacted element is beyond question, as in the symbol of the wooden yoke; Hananiah could not have broken a yoke that existed only in the mind of Jeremiah.

But, further, if we allow that many of these recorded acts must have been performed before the eyes of others, we cannot adequately explain them as due simply to the dramatic instinct of the Semite, translating the thought into an accompanying and quite subordinate deed. This dramatic instinct is doubtless an element in any explanation that is given. Doughty says of a hungry Arab shepherd, "He would often show that he had nothing left to eat with the gesture of the nomads, in crackling the thumb-nail, from the backward, upon the upper front teeth; they would signify with the herdman-prophet, 'He has given them cleanness of teeth.'"[1] We have already seen that the border-line between vivid imagination and the visible act is easily crossed. The prophetic consciousness must have included a whole series of phenomena passing easily from one to the other like the colours of the rainbow, yet all equally "real" to the prophet, and in them all the strong tendency to individualization and concrete imagery would have full play. Indeed, the very vocabulary and syntax of the Hebrew language often throw us back on the accompaying gesture to help out its deficiencies with a "behold!"[2] But prophetic symbolism seems to require something in addition to this to explain its solemn and deliberate performance, its detailed narrative, its conscious ascription to Yahweh. If the breaking of the earthenware flask by Jeremiah was only a dramatic gesture, why was it performed

[1] *Op. cit.*, I. p. 366. [2] *Cf.* Pedersen, *Israel*, p. 113ff.

in semi-privacy, before a select group, and prior to the public declaration in the court of the temple ? [1]

The explanation to which our examination of these acts has led us is *genetic*. The history of prophecy in Israel carries us back to a period in which their imitative or quasi-magical aspect is unmistakable, and therefore their kinship with the working of the primitive mind in general. It has been said that " The essence of children's play is the acting of a part and the realising of a new situation." [2] Through this imitative activity the child enters into a larger world from which it is at present excluded, and realizes a sense of power over it. In the primitive man this instinct is devoted to practical ends ; by imitating an animal, he believes that he creates it, and increases his food-supply.[3] But this belief is bound up with the religious sense of union with the totem ; the subjective result of this ritual reinforces the belief in its objective and creative efficacy ; as Durkheim puts it, " the moral efficacy of the rite, which is real, gives credence to its physical efficacy, which is imaginary." [4] At a higher level of religion, such as we see in the earlier prophets of Israel, these imitative acts have, not only a much more subordinate place, but have gained a new setting, by which they are ascribed to Yahweh, working through the personality of His prophet, who represents Him. At a still higher level, that of Isaiah and Jeremiah, there is a new emphasis on the inner consciousness of fellowship with Yahweh, which enables the prophet to interpret His ways and thoughts to man, in moral and spiritual terms. But the traditions of earlier usage remain by their natural momentum, and the prophet still on occasion may act as well as speak in Yahweh's name. Such acts are in miniature the purpose of Yahweh, and they are the natural and instinctive product of the prophet's identification with Him, though it is always the identification of a trusted servant with his lord's interests. The

[1] *Cf.* Volz, *Kommentar*, p. 204 : " The action is performed solemnly and circumstantially, as a holy ceremony." Vv. 2b-9 seem to be an expansion of the narrative, which describes the point named above.

[2] Sully, *Studies of Childhood*, p. 38.

[3] Durkheim, *Les Élémentaires de la Vie Religieuse*, [2], p. 509.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 513.

symbolic deed, of course, reacts psychologically on the consciousness of the doer, and confirms him in his experience ; it also forcibly expresses the divine purpose to others, since actions speak louder than words. But there is something more than this, something brought over from earlier phases of the imitative act. The prophetic act is itself a part of the will of Yahweh, to whose complete fulfilment it points ; it brings that will nearer to its completion, not only as declaring it, but in some small degree as effecting it. It corresponds with the " prophetic perfect " of Hebrew syntax, by regarding the will of God as already fulfilled. Two examples of a similar order of thought at a later stage of the Biblical religion may serve to make this attitude clearer ; to some degree they find their own explanation from prophetic symbolism.

The first is the Pauline doctrine of the *'arrabōn* or " earnest " of the Spirit. The phenomena ascribed to the Spirit in the primitive Church are external as well as internal, indeed the emphasis fell on the external and visible acts, as we can see from the Apostle's protest against this. These phenomena are something to be explained from the divine, and not from the human side. They bear witness objectively to the truth of the faith, the certainty of God's promises ; they prepare for that larger realization of these promises which is anticipated beyond death ; they are an " earnest " or pledge of the Christian inheritance, a partial possession of that which shall be hereafter possessed in full, in fact, according to another figure, its " first-fruits." Thus the spiritual experience of the Christian does not only declare that which shall be ; it belongs to, and effectively realizes, that future, though only in part. In the same way, the prophetic symbolism of the Old Testament anticipates that which shall be, not by an imitation from without, but by a partial identity within. Thus the restored priests of Zechariah's vision (iii. 8) are " men of a portent," themselves part and " earnest " of the coming Messianic restoration.

The second example may be found in the sacramental teaching of the New Testament. Our modern attitude towards the Christian sacraments of baptism and the

Lord's Supper is apt to be dominated by the antithesis between Protestant and Catholic conceptions, which has been well defined as that between a "declaratory" and an "effective" interpretation of the rites.[1] The Protestant normally emphasises the sacraments as declarations of the Gospel; the Catholic normally regards them as effective means of its grace. But that antithesis is difficult to maintain in purely historical exegesis. In Romans vi., the Apostle Paul described the baptism of believers by immersion as a rite which brings together by its effective symbolism the historic events of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ on the one hand, and the inner experience of the believer on the other—his death to sin and his resurrection to new life. The mystical union is of faith; but the faith effectively expresses itself in a symbolic act. Similarly with what the Apostle calls the communion of the body and blood of Christ;[2] the symbolism of the broken bread and the poured out wine proclaim the Lord's death till He come, but also constitute an act of real—*i.e.*, of effective—fellowship with the risen Christ, and are not simply declaratory. It is in this sense that we may call the prophetic symbolism of the Old Testament sacramental. The prophet who did something at the command of Yahweh was conscious of declaring a "word" of Yahweh; but he was also conscious of effecting something of Yahweh's real purpose. His was an act of expression; but then "expression is the one fundamental sacrament."[3]

Our study of prophetic symbolism may serve to justify two inferences about the prophetic consciousness and its relation to Israel's philosophy of history. In the first place we have seen that there is a nucleus of the "given," whether by vision, audition or unanalysed impulse, and around this a variable margin of free expression (at least from *our* standpoint), representing Yahweh or His purpose. The expression may be by a "Thus doth Yahweh" as well as

[1] So, *e.g.*, O. C. Quick, "Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity," ii.

[2] I. Cor. x. 16, xi. 26.

[3] Whitehead, "Religion in the Making," p. 131; *cf.* pp. 20 and 25 for the symbolism of myth. It is of interest to compare the "Recapitulation" theology of Irenaeus, and similar patristic ideas (*e.g.*, Athanasius, *De Incarnatione*, § 25; Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures*, xix.ff.).

by a " Thus saith Yahweh." It may range from the visible wearing of a wooden yoke to the report of the vision of a wine-cup ; this does not affect the objective reality or authenticity of the expression. Some visions could be translated into action ; others obviously could not, but must be reported by word of mouth.[1] There seems to be a large exercise of personal freedom in the communication or form of the message, however final and ultimate the message itself. The phenomena do not at all suggest a parallel to Gabriel dictating a verbally fixed message to Muhammed.

In the second place, the intense realism of this prophetic symbolism is a particular example of the general principle of a historical revelation. The prophet's act did not simply reveal something already achieved, but hidden ; it helped to achieve something, it made a difference. This implies that man's life is not a shadow-drama, an illusion in the minds of the actors, or a mode of the divine consciousness leaving no room for any effective agency of man. On the contrary, man's deeds have a real significance, and man's history is, under God's direction, the record of real achievements. On such a view of history the whole conception of the Biblical " revelation " rests ; it is what it is because it is more than a revelation ; its revelation is a realization, both of God and man. In that real history the prophets are protagonists ; their human consciousness becomes the effective symbol of the divine consciousness, as their human acts become the effective symbols of the divine acts.

[1] *Cf.*, possibly, Hos. xii. 11, where " similitudes " may denote, or include, symbolic acts : the same verb is used in Is. xl. 18, 25, of the making of material images.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

THE EVIDENCE FOR THE NAME "YAHWEH" OUTSIDE THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE evidence with which I propose to deal is that afforded by various inscribed objects, the Aramaic *papyri* found in Egypt, the Assyrian royal annals, and a certain number of Babylonian private documents. This material ranges roughly from the ninth to the second century B.C.; for I omit a name found on a Canaanite tablet at Taanach, of which the interpretation is doubtful, and which is dated about 2000 B.C.

I. On the Israelite *ostraka* found by Reisner at Samaria, which he assigns to the second half of the ninth, or first half of the eighth century B.C., the divine name is always of the form YW both at the beginning and at the end of words: for example, *Ywyd*[c][1] and [c]*bdyw*.[2]

II. The *tetragrammaton*, transcribed into the cuneiform script, appears in the names of various kings and princes who figure in the Assyrian records between 850 and 700 B.C. The initial form is *Ya-* or *Yau-*, and the final form is *-Yâu*, *-Yau* or *-au* and *-Ya*: for example, (i) *Yaua* (= *Yēhû'*)[3] and *Yau-ḫazi* (= *Yô'āḥāz*);[4] (ii) *Ḫazaki-Ya*, *Ḫazaqi-Yâu*, *Ḫazaqi-Yau* (or *Ḫazaqi-au*) and *Ḫazaki-Ya* (= *Ḥizkiyyāh*).[5]

III. In the Babylonian documents containing the archives of the firm of *Murashû* and sons of Nippur, which cover roughly the years 464 to 404 B.C., there is a number of Jewish names.[6] In them the initial form is *Yâḫû-*, *Yâḫu-* or

[1] Joïada. [2] Obadiah. [3] Jehu.
[4] Joahaz (= Ahaz). [5] Hezekiah.
[6] Amongst these names the interesting non-Biblical (il) *Yâḫû-lunu* (= *Yhwlnw*—"Y. is for us") and (il) *Yâḫû-lakim* (= *Yhwlkm*—"Y. is for you") are noteworthy.

Yaḥû- : for example, (il) *Yâḥû-natanu* (= *Y^{e}hônāthān*).[1] The final form is *-Yâma* (or once *-âma*), standing for *-(Y)âwa*:[2] for example, *Gadal-Yâma* (= *G^{e}dalyāh*).[3]

IV. The orthography of the divine name in the Egyptian *papyri* varies according to the period. At the beginning of names it is YHH- in 495 B.C., as in *Yhh'wr* ;[4] YH- from 484 till 455 B.C., as in *Yhntn* ; YHW- from 456-408 B.C., as in *Yhw'wr* or *Yhwnth* ; YW- and Y- about 300 B.C., as in *Ywntn* and *Yḥnn* ;[5] here the longer, to speak generally, precede the shorter forms. At the end of names, on the contrary, the shorter precede the longer forms ; for -YH (or the orthographically variant -Y') is universal till about 300 B.C., when a few sporadic examples of -YHW occur : for example, *'bdyh*[6] is the usual spelling, while *'bdyhw* is a late variation

V. The evidence of such seals, jar-handles, tombs, and so on, as can be approximately dated by epigraphical evidence, tallies with that already cited. In the initial forms the longer gradually gives way to the shorter spelling : thus YHW- is found from the eighth to the third centuries, B.C., as in *Yhwḥnn*[7] and YW- in the early Greek period, as in *Ywḥnn*. After this, however, the custom varies ; for YHW-, as in *Yhwḥnn*, and Y-, as in *Yḥnn*, are found side by side on Hasmonean coins ; the later Greek period offers YHW-, as in *Yhwḥnn*, and YW, as in *Y^{e}wzr*,[8] indiscriminately. Once there occurs YH- (in *Yh'zr*) on a jar-handle of about the fourth century B.C. found at Jericho. Again, in the final forms the shorter precedes the longer spelling : for YHW- (as in *Zkryhw*) is found from the ninth to the sixth century, B.C., when YH- (as in *Zkryh*)[9] becomes usual. Thus it appears that the change from YHW to YH occurred about 500 B.C. But there is one class of exceptions : a

[1] Jonathan.

[2] It is, of course, possible that *-(Y)âma* stands for *-(y)âm*, and that it was the fashion to prefer *-yām* to *-yāh* at this period in Babylonia (cp. *'^{a}biyyām* and *'^{a}biyyāh*).

[3] Gedaliah. It may be doubted whether the Massoretic punctuation is not often wrong on the evidence of these names—*e.g.*, *Y^{e}da'yāh* is represented by *Yâdah-Yâma* —namely, *Yāda'-Yāh*. In other words, it may be suggested that the Jews at this period regarded the component elements in such words as separate words, and, therefore, accented both equally.

[4] Not found in the Old Testament, but meaning "Y. is light."

[5] Johanan. [6] Obadiah. [7] Johanan. [8] Joezer. [9] Zechariah.

few (but not all) seals, which epigraphists assign to the fifth or fourth century B.C., have YW- instead of YHW or YH (as in *'zyw*).[1] The reason may be either a conscious archaizing on the part of certain families or exigencies of space.[2]

From the facts here outlined the following table may be drawn up :—

	(i) Initial.	(ii) Final.
9th cent. B.C., . . .	YW- and *Ya-*	-YW
8th cent. B.C., . . .	*Yau-*	*-Yâu, -Yau (-au), -Ya*
7th cent. B.C., . . .	YH-	-YHW
c. 525 B.C., ...	YHW-	
c. 500 B.C., ...	YHH-	
c. 475 B.C., ...		-YH
c. 450 B.C., ...	YH-	
c. 425 B.C., ...	YH- *Yâhu-, Yâhû-, Yahû-*	-YH, -Y' *-Yâma, -âma*
c. 400 B.C., ...	YH-, YW-	(-YW)
c. 300 B.C., ...	YW-, Y-	-YHW, -YH
c. 200 B.C., ...	YHW	

This table shows clearly that there was little system, but one or two facts emerge from it : (i) that YW was the earliest form ; (ii) that there was a gradual tendency to lengthen it into YH, then YHW (and finally YHH), but that this tendency came to an end very early in the fifth century, B.C. ; (iii) that YHW or YH (Y') remained constant for the greater part of the fifth century ; (iv) that after the fifth century there was no principle, and that any form was arbitrarily selected. The spelling, therefore, of the tetragrammaton was purely a matter of fashion, which varied from time to time and possibly from place to place.

But what can be said of the pronunciation ? Is it to be

[1] Uzziah. It may, of course, be doubted whether all names ending in -YH contain the *tetragrammaton ;* for -YH may be the Hebrew form of the common Semitic ending *-iya ;* for example, *Ṭôbiyyāh* the Ammonite (cp. Ass. *Tābiya* and *'âriyyah* the Hittite (cp. Ass. *Uriyâ* in the late and *Uriya* in the Cassite period), as Jastrow has shown.

[2] Another example of this may be seen in the curiously abbreviated form *Yḳym* for *Yhwyḳym* on a seal which also has *'syw* for *'syh(w)*.

supposed—to take an example from the Aramaic *papyri* and apply to it the principles of the Massoretic pronunciation—that what was called *Yāhnāthān* (YHNTN) in 484 B.C. became *Yᵉhônāthān* (YHWNTN) in 525 B.C. and *Yônāthān* (YWNTN)[1] in 300 B.C. ? Further, while many of these forms harmonise with the pronunciation represented by the Assyrian and Babylonian transcriptions, others do not agree with it at all, even if due allowance is made for the imperfections of the cuneiform script : for example, *Ya-* totally fails to suit either *Yᵉhô* (YHW) or *Yô* (YW). Again, this vocalization is as impossible in the case of YH as in that of YHH,[2] and is hardly possible with Y'. It is necessary, therefore, to look for a common pronunciation which will suit all the known varieties of spelling ; for the diverse forms represent mere variations in orthography, since it is hardly likely that the same divine name was pronounced in several different ways. This can be hardly anything else than *Yâ*, whether written *Yā*(*w*) or *Yā*(*h*) or *Ya*(*hw*), or even *Yā*(') ; for Hebrew orthography required, with few exceptions, a quiescent consonant to support a final vowel. This is confirmed by the early Assyrian form *Ya*. In the later forms the *u* in *Yâu* and *Yau*, like the *m* in *Yâma*, is probably merely a device for representing a final *w*, or was added because the originally quiescent *w* had come to be sounded.

The *h* in the longer forms YHW and YHH is merely a *litera prolongationis* to ensure that the *ā* was fully sounded. The same device is found in the writing of the name Darius, which is in the Egyptian *papyri* first represented by DRYWŠ = *Dariyawuš*, then by DRYHWŠ = *Dariyā*(*h*)*wuš* (not *Dariyahawuš*), and finally by DRYWHWŠ = *Darîwā*(*h*)*wuš ;* the last example is particularly striking, because a *y* also has been inserted to ensure the full pronunciation of the *î*. There appears to be an interesting use of this *h* in the Old Testament ; for it may be suggested that originally 'BRHM, *'Abhrā*(*h*)*m*, was merely another way of writing 'BRM, *'Abhrām*, with the *h*, to ensure that the second vowel was

[1] Jonathan.

[2] So badly was *h* felt to suit *ō*, that the spelling of the pronominal suffix (— *ēhû* >) -*ōh* was at a very early date changed to -W(-*ô*).

sounded long. When the reason for the *h* was forgotten, the well-known story (P) was invented, to account for the patriarch's apparent change of name. This explanation of the medial *h* has two advantages—(i) it enables the same sound *Yā* to be assigned to every form of the tetragrammation, except the full form YHWH ; (ii) it agrees with all the Assyrian transcriptions, though not with the Babylonian *Yâḫû*. This, however, belongs to the period when the reason for the *h* had been forgotten and it had come to be pronounced as a full consonant, as the explanation of the change from *'abhrām* to *'abrāhām* implies. The history of this *h* is then this : *c.* 650 B.C. it first makes its appearance in YHW ; *c.* 500 B.C. it was sometimes omitted, but more often inserted in Darius and other foreign names, but, as the variations show, not pronounced ; *c.* 425 B.C., the form *Yâḫû* shows that it was sometimes, at least, pronounced ; *c.* 375 B.C., the explanation of it in *'abrāhām* shows that its original purpose was forgotten, and that it was sounded. When it had come to be regularly pronounced, *-Yāhû* instead of *-Yā(h)w* was the natural pronunciation of the final form, on the analogy of (*saḫw* >) *sāḫû* ' swimming ' ; in the same way (*Yĕhaw-* > *Yĕhau-* >) *Yĕhô-* and (*Yaw-* > *Yau-* >) *Yô-* were the only possible pronunciations of the initial forms. By the time of the LXX. the change from initial *Yā* to *Yô* was almost complete ; for the latter has almost entirely ousted the former, of which the sole example in the LXX. is Ιαδα beside Ιωδα or Ιωαδα (*Y'hô'addāh*).[1]

The independent form of the *tetragrammation* is (i) YHWH on the Moabite Stone (*c.* 850 B.C.) ; (ii) YHH once in an Aramaic *papyrus* (*c.* 447 B.C.) ; (iii) YHW frequently on *papyri* *c.* 465-408 B.C. ; (iv) either YHW or YH on jar-handles found at Jericho and Jerusalem (*c.* 5th and 4th century B.C.) ; (v) YHW on a coin issued probably at Gaza (*c.* 490 B.C.). Once again there is a gradual tendency to the shorter spelling, and once again it is necessary to assume that the same pronunciation underlies at least the forms YHH, YHW, and YH ; for it is inconceivable that in the same centuries the same divine name should have three distinct pronunciations—*Yāhōh* or *Yāhāh* (?), *Yāhû*, and *Yāh*.

[1] Jehoaddah.

But what must be said of the form YHWH on the earliest monument? The ordinary answer to the question is that this is the proper and original name, of which the other forms are abbreviations. But this solution is open to the following objections:—(i) no other Semitic race ever abbreviated the names of its gods; (ii) it is *a priori* hard to believe that a name held so sacred as *Yahweh* was by the Jews would be commonly shortened; (iii) the early names given to gods tend to be short and inexplicable, since they go back to the primitive speech of a hoary antiquity; (iv) endeavours to explain or make intelligible such names are usually the work of a later and more reflective age, like the Greek efforts to explain the name *Apollo*, as recorded by Plato.

Now tradition relates that at the time of the deliverance from Egypt the new idea which did more than anything else to unite the Hebrews was the worship of one national God. The adoption of the pre-eminent god of the patriarchs and the alteration of his name from the now meaningless *Yâ* to the, whatever its precise meaning, significant *Yahweh*, all served to impress the new idea upon the minds of the people.[1] The close resemblance of the old to the new name would facilitate its acceptance. Further, the origin and meaning of the former had long been forgotten, if indeed it had in significance been anything else than ejaculatory, like Ἴακχος, Βάκχος, and Εὔιος;[2] the latter, whether it predicated becoming or bringing into being, was so pregnant with meaning that it would readily find favour and be easily remembered. The story of its revelation by God himself, already current in the narrative of the Elohist (*c.* 8th century B.C.), shows how soon the new name was held to be of divine origin. Thus it came to be accounted so sacred that presently it might not lightly be taken upon the lips nor be set in writing, except in the Scriptures. In this spirit its use was avoided in daily life, and the old form *Yā*—*Yā(w)* or

[1] It is interesting to notice that the old form YW is used in the name of Moses' mother YWKBD, although it may be a mere chance, since both occurrences are in P (Ex. vi. 20 and Num. xxvi. 50).

[2] It is to be remarked that *yā* (*e.g.*, Aram. and extra-Bibl. Hebr. *yāh*, Syr. and Arab. *yâ*, and Ass.-Bab. *yâyaya*; cp. Eth. *yō* and *yē*) was a universal Semitic exclamation. Further *Yâ* (written *I-a-a*) has been found as a personal name on a Semitic (Babylonian) seal (*c.* 2100 B.C).

Yā(h)—was employed both in proper names, where conservatism would aid its retention, and in every kind of profane writing. The Moabite stone is no real exception; for it bears an inscription written by a foreigner to whom a defeated enemy's god was in no way an object of awe. It shows, however, that at this early date the *tetragrammaton* had not become so sacred as never to be uttered, though probably evaded in ordinary use, as the proper names show; for otherwise a Moabite could not have known it.[1]

This theory then accounts for two facts which have hitherto been not explained but explained away: (i) why the form YHWH is never found outside the Old Testament, except in one or possibly two inscriptions;[2] and (ii) why there is no essential discrepancy between the statement that in the days of Enosh men began "to call upon the name of Yahweh,"[3] and God's assertion that in the time of the patriarchs "by my name Yahweh I was not known."[4] For in the first passage the Yahwist (or possibly his editor) has used the well-known *Yahweh* where strict history without doubt required the almost forgotten *Yāh*; in the second passage the priestly writer has this much right, that God was known to the patriarchs as *Yāh*, not as *Yahweh*, until the new name came into use at the time of the deliverance from Egyptian bondage.

[1] The fact that it is YHW, not YHWH, on a Phoenician or Philistine coin, only shows that, if the inscription is rightly read, the shorter form was current also among foreigners by the 5th century B.C.

[2] Quotations from the Scriptures, of course, such as *bšm* YHWH, are to be discounted.

[3] Gen. iv. 26 (J.). [4] Exod. vi. 3 (P).

G. R. DRIVER.

THE TREE OF LIFE IN EDEN.

One of the much-discussed points of the narrative of Gen. iii. is the problem whether or not Adam, before being driven forth from Paradise, had eaten of the Tree of Life. Nearly all students suppose he had not, and they do so on account of iii. 22: "The Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now lest (*pen*) he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of Life, and eat and live for ever"; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden. These words seem to presuppose that he had not eaten, even when we take into account the fact that the word "also" was not used by the Jahvist; it is lacking in the Septuagint.

The word *pen*, "lest," is always interpreted in the sense that the fact has *not yet* happened. That I think unnecessary; *pen* is used also for a fact which has happened, but which may not happen again. *Pen* in that case has the meaning of "lest further," "lest more." For instance, Ex. i. 7 says: "And the children of Israel were fruitful and increased abundantly, and multiplied (*yirbu*) and waxed exceedingly mighty; and the land was filled with them." And the Pharaoh said unto his people: Come, let us deal wisely with them, *lest* they multiply (*pen yirbu*). Here *pen* is clearly: "lest further." The word "lest" puts a period to a fact that is just happening. Similarly, 1 Sam. xiii. 19, where the Philistines said: *Lest* the Hebrews make swords and spears.

The word *pen* in Gen. iii. 22, therefore, does not require the interpretation that man, before being driven out, had not eaten of the tree of life.

Prof. Ungnad, in his interesting article in ZDMG 79, states that the first men did *not* eat of the tree of life. He says: der Weg zum Baume des Lebens führt über den Baum der Erkenntnis. Erst nachdem von dem letzteren

gegessen ist, besteht die Gefahr dass auch der Erstere probirt wird. And further : Nur der Baum der Erkenntnis war zunächst im Bereich der ersten Menschen ; erst nachdem sie von ihm gegessen hatten, war die Möglichkeit gegeben, dass sie ihre Hände auch zum Baume des Lebens ausstrecken. Prof. Ungnad says : the first man " entdeckte " (discovered) the tree of life *only after having eaten* of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. But a tree who is " *in the midst* " of the garden, cannot be " discovered," he is obvious to the eye. The term " to discover " has here only a tolerable signification when it means : to discover *the very character* of that tree as being the tree of life, whilst formerly they took it for a common tree. But so the difficulty is not taken away, for, if they took it for a common tree, then they treated it as a common tree : they did eat of its fruit. But just that is denied by Prof. Ungnad.

I think the question is rather simple, when we keep an eye upon the place occupied by the tree of life in the oriental world.

The tree of life, I think, is not an invention of the Biblical writer, but is derived from the oriental mythological data.

Tree of life, water of life, food of life, oil of life, plant of life—all these belong to the same group of ideas : they are all attributes of the residence of the gods ; it is *ambrosia* = sanskr. a-mṛ-ta—the eating thereof brings immortality. Immortality is not an inherent property of the gods ; it is obtained and maintained by eating of the tree of life, plant of life, etc. " To hinder somebody from the tree of life " is an expression for : he is mortal. To give somebody access to that tree, means : he is immortal.

Now, in the Babylonian world we find the maxim :

> When the Gods created man,
> they fixed death for men
> Life they reserved to themselves.

(In the so-called Meissner Fragment of the Epic of Gilgamesh.)

Accordingly none of the Babylonian creation stories tells us that the Creator breathed into the nostrils of men the breath of life as is narrated in the 2nd chapter of Genesis.

Accordingly we *always* find in the Babylonian world the tree of life, water of life, etc., OUT *of the reach of men.* The tree of life is in the garden of the Gods and unattainable for men. Divine beings as Ningiszida, Dumuzi, Humbaba are the guardians thereof. Gilgamesh and Enkidu try in vain to penetrate to the holy spot. (5th Table of the Epic.)

In the 9th and 10th Table of the same Epic is mentioned the divine mountain *mašû* with the tree of life, here called "tree of the Gods" (*iṣṣu ša ilani*). Siduri Sabitu is the guardian. Gilgamesh, fearing death, is seeking after an herb with sovereign powers against death. Siduri Sabitu, when she sees the hero, Gilgamesh, is filled with terror and locks her doors. He cannot arrive at the tree of life.

At the end of his journey (it is rather a voyage) Utnapistim tells him of a plant of life, which grew in the bottom of the ocean. Gilgamesh plunges into the sea, from which he brings up the needful plant. Now the plant of life is in the hand of a mortal man! But it is a short pleasure. While Gilgamesh bathes in a pool, a serpent steals the precious plant. So Gilgamesh has sadly failed in all his endeavours. The search for eternal life has ended in failure, though two-thirds of him is God, and only one-third of him is mortal men.

The same idea is expressed by the Alexander romance, which tells how Alexander the Great sought in vain for the fountain of life. Even the greatest of men has not eternal life. This idea is explained in this way: they cannot reach the tree of life, the fountain of life, etc.

Now we will turn to the Old Testament. Here we find: *First:* Jahve breathed into the nostrils of man the breath of life.

Secondly: Jahve put the man in God's dwelling-place: the garden of Eden. God and man *live together.*

Thirdly: In the garden of Eden is planted the tree of life, *but not as a forbidden tree.*

These three data, the breath of life, living together with the Gods, tree of life, have the same meaning: *man is immortal.* The most interesting point is here the cleverness of the Biblical writer in using the old borrowed terms to

express his new ideas. He accepts the term : tree of life, but for him it cannot be a forbidden tree, since for him man is enriched with eternal life and God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. His abode in the shadow of the tree of life enables him to keep up continually his divine quality. His immortality is of a conditional character : only as long as he eats the fruit of the tree of life, he will be immortal. That is the reason why the tree of life is placed *in the midst* of the garden : man must find it conveniently.

Whereas in Babylonian literature man is created as a mortal being, so in Babylonia the tree of life is placed within the abode of the Gods, which is separated from the dwelling-places of man, and for man unattainable—the Biblical narrative states the case in this way : man shares divine breath, lives in the presence of God, and the tree of life has a paramount place in his abode.

All this is quite clear, I think, but in this case it is out of question whether men in Paradise did eat of the tree of life or not. The meaning of the Biblical writer clearly is *he did*. He who refuses to accept that, denies the kernel of the whole narrative. Then the tree of life is in the garden as a sentinel in the garret.

For the rest the Biblical writer knows also the *forbidden* tree of the Babylonian tradition, but for him it is not the *gisti* (tree of life), but the *giszida* (trees of truth or knowledge). With admirable inventiveness he avails himself of that argument to introduce the ethical element in his narrative. In this way : to eat the fruit of that tree of knowledge will be attended with *death*. And the idea " death " is defined here as : to be driven away from the tree of life. Obedience is the condition for eternal life. Disobedience brings about the situation, in the Babylonian tradition supposed *above :* mortality, removal from the tree of life.

According to the Biblical conception the here diverging lines will come together in the celestial Paradise, the blessed will have the right to come to the tree of life again (Apoc. xxii. 14) and eat of its fruit (Apoc. ii. 7).

H. TH. OBBINK.

DER GOTT DES MOSE.

Den vergangenen Zeiten war Mose das Gesetz, unsere Vorgänger sahen in ihm den Stifter einer verhältnismässig bescheidenen Volksreligion. Aber der Umschwung, der sich im Laufe der letzten Jahrzehnte in der Wissenschaft vom A. T. vollzogen hat, tritt gerade in der Beurteilung Moses am deutlichsten zu Tage. Wir stehen noch ganz auf dem Boden der geschichtlichen Entwicklung, wie ihn die Schule Wellhausens gelegt hat, aber wir suchen daneben die Führer, die diese geschichtliche Entwicklung gemeistert haben; wir erkennen das Rationale des Gesetzmässigen in der geschichtlichen Entwicklung noch ebenso an wie jene Gelehrten, aber wir beugen uns zugleich vor dem Irrationalen des Geheimnisses, das in den Führern und in ihrer glaübigen Gemeinde verborgen liegt. Wir sind vor allem von der Gewissheit durchdrungen, dass ein religiöser Strom an seinem Quellort am stärksten und reinsten sprudelt, und dass am Anfang einer kraftvollen, in der Geschichte bewährten Bewegung ein mächtiger Genius stehen muss. So ist uns Heutigen Mose der gewaltige Schöpfer einer gewaltigen Religion, der Heros, dessen religiöse Ergriffenheit und hochragende Erkenntnis wir nur ahnen, nicht völlig erfassen können. Im Zusammenhang mit dieser Wandlung ist es auch fast allen heutigen Vertreten des A. T. wieder möglich geworden, den *Dekalog* als mosaisch anzunehmen. Wir sehen aber im Dekalog nicht eben bloss eine mosaische Urkunde; er ist uns das *Programm* Moses, ein Programm, dessen Tiefen wir mittelst der religionsgeschichtlichen Vergleichung auszuschöpfen haben und über dessen gewaltige Grösse wir immer mehr staunen, je länger wir uns mit ihm beschäftigen. Wir sehen in den Forderungen des Dekalogs Ideale, mit denen

Mose den Jahrhunderten vorauseilte, zu denen er sein Volk mit der Gewalt des göttlichen Erziehers emporzwang, und die sich im Lauf der Jahrhunderte wirksam entfaltet haben. Um aber dem Dekalog völlig gerecht zu werden, dürfen wir ihn nicht aus einer Zeit heraus beurteilen, in der sein Gehalt längst Gemeingut geworden war, sondern aus der Zeit heraus, in der er entstand und in der er innerhalb der Umwelt etwas völlig Neues war.

Ausser dem Dekalog besitzen wir kein sicheres Wort von Mose. Aber ein weiteres Zeugnis seines Werkes ist die gesamte Entwicklung des A.T.; und zwar gilt dies nicht bloss von der Religion der nachfolgenden Führer, sondern gerade auch die volkstümliche und die offizielle Religion des A.T. tragen—das zeigt der Vergleich mit den übrigen Religionen der Antike—weithin den Stempel des mosaischen Geistes, so dass von der späteren Entwicklung aus stets ein Rückschluss auf den Urheber gemacht werden kann. Weiter haben wir die gewichtigen Zeugnisse der Propheten, Am. 5 : 25, Jer. 7 : 22f, und besonders jene Aussagen in Hos. 2 : 17 und Jer, 2 : 2, wo die Mosezeit als die leuchtende Urzeit, als die Brautzeit gefeiert wird. Das ist nicht etwa prophetische Idealisierung, sondern genau so geschichtliche Tatsache wie die Schilderung der christlichen Urgemeinde in Acta 2ff. Ein letztes Zeugnis gibt die religionsgeschichtliche Vergleichung der Mosereligion mit den primitiven Religionen und mit den grossen Kulturreligionen der Antike, besonders Aegyptens und Babyloniens; gerade durch diese Vergleichung ist uns erst der Mann Mose und sein Werk in seiner vollen Grösse und Eigenart wieder entdeckt worden; es ist, möchte man sagen, hier auch eine Art bedeutsamer Wiederausgrabung vor sich gegangen.

Was vernehmen wir nun aus diesen Zeugnissen über den *Gott des Mose?* Ich kann in der Kürze der Zeit nur das Wesentliche herausgreifen.

1. *Du sollst keine anderen Götter neben mir haben.*—Dieser Gott will seinen Verehrern *alles in allem* sein. Er duldet keine dualistische Scheidung der Frömmigkeit in Götterglaube und Dämonenglaube, er will selbst Gott und Dämon sein; er duldet keine Muttergottheit neben sich, er will

selbst Vater und Mutter sein ; er verbietet jede Winkel- und Privatfrömmigkeit, wie sie sich im Glauben an Sippen-, Toten- und Ahnengeister bekundet, er will selbst jeden Winkel beherrschen. Dies ist, verglichen mit der übrigen Antike, eine ungeheure Forderung des Mose. Sonst überall in der Antike, in der primitiven wie in der zivilisiertesten, herrscht der Glaube : je mehr Götter, desto besser, je vielfältiger das Pantheon, desto mehr Macht und Hilfe fliesst von dort dem Menschen zu. Auch die berühmte Inschrift der Nebo-Statue : " auf Nebo vertraue, auf einen andern Gott vertraue nicht ! " erwähnt neben Nebo unbefangen Enlil, dessen Liebling Nebo sei ; auch neben Aton, dem Gott des Amenophis, bleibt ruhig die Selbstvergötterung des Königs. Hier aber steht ein Gott voll Intoleranz, voll Eifersucht, der von seinen Gläubigen restlos alle Verehrung begehrt. Er ist Freund und Feind ; was der Nation, der Familie, dem einzelnen widerfährt, kommt alles von ihm ; während sonst überall die verschiedenen Erscheinungen der Natur auf ebensoviele verschiedene übersinnliche Kräfte zurückgeführt werden, umfasst hier der Eine alles : den Glanz der Sonne, das Leuchten des Mondes, das Funkeln des Abendsterns.

Der antike Mensch ist voller Religiosität, aber er verteilt seine religiösen Gefühle auf so und so viele geheimnisvolle Gestalten ; insbesondere teilt er sein religiöses Herz in die zwei Gebiete der Angst und des Vertrauens, die Angst gehört in der Hauptsache den Dämonen, das Vertrauen den lichten Göttern, der Muttergöttin, dem blutsverwandten Geiste. Solche Vielfältigkeit der religiösen Gefühle, solche Scheidung des Herzens lehnt der Gott des Mose rücksichtslos ab ; jede religiöse Bewegung soll demselben Zentrum zustreben, jede Anbetung in Zittern und in Wonne soll ihm allein gespendet sein. Es ist eine ungeheure Forderung, und sie birgt in sich eine ungeheure *Wirkung*, vielleicht nicht für den Augenblick, aber im Fortschritt der Jahrhunderte. Der Vielgötter- und Vielgeisterglaube schliesst eine einheitliche Lebens- und Weltanschauung aus, hier ist nur Reichtum und Gegensatz, aber nicht Einheit, wo aber der Gott alles verlangt und alles sein will, da konnte auch—gerade weil die Weltbetrachtung

des antiken Menschen religiös war—das Leben, die Natur, die Welt als Einheit gefasst werden.

Der Vielgötter- und Vielgeisterglaube schliesst die Glaubenssicherheit aus. Wer weiss, ob nicht irgendwo ein Dämon lauert, den man nicht kennt oder nicht beachtet hat, wer weiss, ob nicht noch ein Gott existiert, dessen Name bis jetzt nie aus dem Jenseits gedrungen ist-darum reden ja auch die alten Gebete immer wieder vom "unbekannten Gott" aus Angst etwas zu versäumen; wer weiss, ob der angerufene Gott gerade der mächtige und hilfsbereite ist, da ja im Pantheon selbst fortwährend Streit regiert! Wo aber der eine Gott alles fordert und alles sein will, wo das ganze Herz sich ihm verschreiben soll, wo nicht einmal die mütterliche Fürsprecherin vergönnt wird, da muss schliesslich in das Herz eine unendliche Einheit, Klarheit, Sicherheit einziehen. Das ist keimartig in jenem ersten Gebot des Dekalogs eingeschlosson: du sollst keine anderen Götter neben mir haben.

2. *Du sollst dir kein Bildnis noch Gleichnis machen.* Der Gott des Mose will bildlos vorgestellt und bildlos angebetet werden. Es war ein seltsamer Irrtum, hierin eine primitive Form der Religiosität zu erblicken. Vielmehr ist auch dies eine ungeheure Forderung Moses, ein gewaltiger Zwang, den er auf seine gläubige Gemeinde ausübte, der erste Schritt zu jenem Wort: Gott ist Geist, und die ihn anbeten, müssen ihn im Geist anbeten. Jede andere Religion, die primitive wie die zivilisierteste, macht dem Anhänger das Zugeständnis, die Gottheit in sichtbaren Symbolen zu schauen, in der Sonnenscheibe, im Stier, in der königlichen Gestalt des Menschen, in irgend etwas Kreatürlichem und dem Gemüt Nahestehendem. Mose verlangt von den Seinen, auf jede Anschauung zu verzichten; sie sollen das Übersinnliche übersinnlich fassen. Das Auge des Israeliten wird zu einer ungeheuren Sehkraft gezwungen, es soll ins Übersinnliche selbst eindringen, den Unterscheid zwischen dem Sinnenfälligen und dem Übersinnlichen, zwischen Himmel und Erde, zwischen Gott und Geschöpf grundsätzlich durchschauen. Die stärkste erzieherische Macht aber ist die Übung, und wie die Bilder des Kultus die übrige Antike in der sinnlichen Auffassung der Gottheit

bestärkt haben, so hat umgekehrt der bildlose Kult des Mose fortwährend und gesetzmässig die Auffassung Jahwes als eines Geistwesens in seinen treuesten Nachfolgern erhalten und befestigt. In den grossen Religionen des Altertums ist der Höhepunkt des Festdramas die Enthüllung des Bildes, der verschleierte Gott wird offenbar, der sichtbare Gott steigt hernieder, die Tausende der Wallfahrer werfen sich anbetend zu Boden, die verzückte Gemeinde hat ihren Gott *geschaut.* Mose verzichtet auf diese gewaltige Erhebung des dramatischen Festspiels, er kümmert sich nicht um diese feierlichen Regungen des Gemüts, der Künstler, der das Gottesbild mit dem Meissel aushauen will, hat keinen Zugang zum Tempel der israelitischen Religion—fürwahr ein herber Verzicht, die Religion des A.T. ist arm an Kunst, wie sie arm ist an Mythos! Aber der Verlust wird weit aufgewogen durch den Gewinn. Mose entzieht Gott dem Auge und meisselt ihn ins Herz hinein; und indem Gott durch nichts abgebildet werden kann, kann er auch nichts ähnlich sein; er ist der gänzlich Unvergleichliche, der schlechthin Andere, der Heilige, das vollendete Geheimnis.

3. Der Dekalog beginnt mit dem Wort: Ich bin Jahwe, dein Gott, der ich dich aus Aegyptenland, aus dem Diensthause, geführt habe. Der Gott hat sich seinem Volk in einer geschichtlichen Tat genaht. Und auf dieser grundlegenden Heilstatsache erhebt sich die Forderung: du sollst! du sollst! die Anbetung dieses Gottes vollzieht sich im *Gehorsam.* Auch hier wie im N.T. geht also dem menschlichen Tun die göttliche Gnade voraus; es ist durchaus nicht so, dass das A.T. Gesetz, das N.T. Gnade wäre, beide, A.T. und N.T., sind sich wesensgleich. Aber bedeutsam hebt sich der Gott des Mose in Wesen, Offenbarung und Verehrung von den übrigen Göttern der Antike ab. Die sonstigen Religionen, die primitiven wie die zivilisiertesten, fassen das göttliche Wesen naturhaft, sie suchen und finden das Geschenk der Götter in den Gütern der sinnlichen Welt, und sie gestalten daher den Kultus, die Anbetung der Götter naturhaft und sinnlich. Amenophis hat hierin keine Änderung gebracht; in hohen Tönen preist er einen Naturgott und das physische Leben, das der Sonnengott

spendet. Der bildlose Gott des Mose wirkt im *geistigen* Leben, in der Geschichte und in der sittlichen Ordnung. Seine Religion will gerade das öffentliche Leben durchdringen und seine Erwählung bindet sich an eine Nation. Dies scheint eine Schranke zu sein, ist aber in Wirklichkeit für jene Anfangszeit eine reinigende Kraft. Die Religion ist stets in Gefahr, das Individuellste und das Selbstsüchtigste zu sein, und die Religion der Naturgötter vergrössert diese Gefahr ; hier sucht das fromme Ich eben das Materielle, was es für sich und für sein Haus braucht, Sonnenschein, Regen, Reichtum und langes Leben. Der Gott des Mose zwingt seine Gläubigen, sich als Glied eines Ganzen zu fühlen und sich in eine Genossenschaft einzufügen, in die Genossenschaft eines geschichtlich werdenden und sittlich geordneten Volkes. Der Verehrer des Naturgottes entnimmt seiner Religion im Grunde nur das Recht auf Anspruch und Lohn ; das " du sollst " des Mose weckt die Verantwortung, die Verantwortung, die der religiöse Mensch eben dem *spendenden* Gott schuldig ist. Und weiter : dieser Gott ist nicht bloss der Urheber *einzelner* geschichtlicher Taten, das sind schliesslich die übrigen Götter der Antike auch, auch nicht bloss der Urheber einzelner atomistischer Forderungen, auch das findet sich in der übrigen Antike. Welcher der ungezählten Götter im Kodex Hammurapi ist eigentlich der Schöpfer des Rechts ? Jahwe aber ist ein einziger und Mose kennt nur *sein* göttliches Wirken, so werden auch die geschichtlichen Tatsachen und die sittlichen Forderungen zur Einheit, es entsteht keimartig der Glaube an einen geschichtlichen Kosmos und an einen sittlichen Kosmos, en einen Geschichts*plan* und an ein Sitten*gesetz*, an eine in der Geschichte ständig sich auswirkende göttliche Vergeltung.

4. Ein Letztes : dieser Gott des Mose ist *höchstes Geheimnis* und doch zugleich *jedem in der einfachsten Weise erreichbar*. Er ist alles in allem, bildlos, von aller Natur und Kreatur völlig verschieden, intolerant, eifersüchtig, furchtbar in seinem Zorn, der schlechthin Heilige. Andere Religionen halten es für möglich, dass das menschliche Ich mystisch mit der Gottheit sich verschmelze, der Gott ist schliesslich eben doch nichts anderes als Natur, höchste Kreatur.

Bei Moses Gott ist das unmöglich, göttliche Majestät und Menschenwelt sind völlige Gegensätze. Aber der *Dienst* dieses Gottes ist ganz einfach; jeder kann ihn kennen und kann ihn leisten, denn jeder hat ein Gewissen. Hier ist es also nicht bloss der König, der als Sohn Gottes besondere Offenbarung geniesst, hier ist kein Mysterium, für das nur ein geweihter Kreis den Schlüssel hat, hier herrscht nicht die Zeremonie oder die Magie, in deren Labyrinth nur der Priester sich zurechtfindet; es gilt vom Dekalog tatsächlich, was Dt. 30 : 11-14 steht: "das Gebot, das ich dir heute gebiete, ist dir nicht zu schwer, nicht unerreichbar; es ist nicht im Himmel, nicht jenseits des Meers, ganz nahe ist dir das Wort, in deinem Mund und in deinem Herzen, dass du es tun kannst." Überall sonst im Altertum gebietet der Priester und ist der Priester unentbehrlich; der Gott des Mose hat die Laienreligion geschaffen und alle zu Brüdern gemacht. Viel grösser noch als die Befreiung aus dem Diensthause Aegyptens ist diese Befreiung des Volkes aus der Vormundschaft der Priester zur religiösen Mündigkeit.

Das sind Moses ideale Forderungen. Aus all dem Gesagten geht hervor, dass die Religion des Mose nicht etwa bloss der Superlativ, die Krone der antiken Religionen ist, sondern eine ihnen gänzlich entgegengestzte, eine völlig einzigartige: dort Natur, hier Geist, dort Priestergebundenheit, hier Freiheit, dort Dualismus und Vielgespaltenheit, hier die eine Kausalität. Das alles ist uns durch die religionsvergleichende Wissenschaft klar geworden. Wir verstehen aber, dass Moses Glaube und Forderung dem Volk zu hoch war, wir verstehen den weiteren Gang der Geschichte: sobald der Führer sich entfernt, fällt das Volk—selbst während der Brautzeit—dem goldenen Kalbe zu, und als der Mann Gottes starb, da sank Israel in das Wesen der anderen Völker zurück und der mosaische Quell wurde mit viel trübem Wasser vermischt. Aber die religiöse Kraft des Mose setzte sich trotzdem in den folgenden Jahrhunderten durch und kam in den Propheten zur vollen Entfaltung: aus dem Glauben an eine göttliche Kausalität entstand die Möglichkeit der unmittelbaren persönlichen Gottesgemeinschaft von Geist zu Geist, aus der Wesens-

verbindung von Religion und Sittlichkeit erwuchs der freie Mensch, dessen sittliche Kraft durch keine Magie zerstört wurde. Und die Keime, die im Dekalog vorhanden waren, wirken im Neuen Testament weiter; es ist der gleiche Baum Gottes, dessen Werden und Wachsen wir von Mose über die Propheten bis auf Jesus Christus verfolgen können, und von dessen Früchten wir Heutigen leben.

PAUL VOLZ.

THE PARADISE STORY OF EZEKIEL XXVIII.

I BELIEVE that Cornill in 1886 was the first to recognize that behind Ezekiel's Dirge over the King of Tyre lies a tradition or story of Paradise independent of that preserved in Gen. ii. and iii., and more strongly marked by mythological character. The prophet did not adapt the narrative of J. to his purpose, nor did he invent a number of curious traits to heighten the colouring of his poem; rather, he drew upon some story which had long been familiar to his countrymen in their native home. We all admit this now; and further research since 1886 has confirmed Cornill's insight.

The text of Ez. xxviii. 12-19 is notoriously difficult, and in places corrupt. It has suffered from considerable interpolations—*e.g.*, the list of precious stones in v. 13, the reference to merchandise in v. 16. Moreover, here and there words occur, the meaning of which is quite uncertain. The poem is entitled a Ḳînâ, so that we expect to find it written in the *ḳînâ*-measure, as elsewhere in Ez.—*e.g.*, chs. 19 and 27—and without doubt that measure prevails (3 : 2), though it cannot be carried through continuously in the present state of the text: thus of the 20 lines, 8 are certainly and 2 are probably 3 : 2; but 8 seem to be 3 : 3, and two lines 2 : 2. The following translation attempts to reproduce the rhythms of the original, with a minimum of conjectural changes :—

12 Thoú wast wíse to perféction,
Pérfect in béauty.

13 In Éden, God's gárden, thou wást ;
Géms of all kínds formed thy cóvering :
. . . . . .
and gold
Was the wórk of thy círclets and oúches,
In the dáy of thy bírth.
14 With the gúardian chérub I pláced thee ;
In the moúntain of Gód thou wást ;
In the mídst of fíre-stones thou wálkest.
15 Blámeless wert thóu in thy wáys
From the dáy of thy bírth ;
Till wróng was discóvered withín thee,
Ánd thou didst sín.
16 . . . . . .
Thou wast degráded from the móuntain of Gód ;
And the guárdian chérub destróyed thee
From the mídst of the stónes of fíre.
17 Thy heárt waxed próud in thy beáuty,
Depráving thy wísdom.
For thy spléndour, thy mánifold wíckedness,
I cást thee to eárth ;
I delívered thee úp unto kíngs
To seé their desíre on thee.
18 (By thine ínfamous tráffick) thou degrádest thy
sanctity ;
So I sént forth a fíre from the mídst of thee,
It hath devoúred thee.
And I máde thee as dúst on the eárth,
For áll to behóld thee.
19 Áll of the nátions who knów thee
Look ón with dísmay.
In útter destrúction
Thou art vánished for éver.

The closing verses of the Poem, which describe the fall of Tyre itself, must be understood as prophetic of the future, though the tenses speak as though the fall had actually taken place.

We are to picture a glorious being, who lived in God's garden, blameless by nature, and endowed with wisdom

and beauty, arrayed, moreover, like an angel, in a glittering robe of jewels. The Garden of God was situated on the mountain of God; and there he lived with the cherub who guarded it; there, too, he moved at liberty on the fiery slopes ablaze with the divine Presence. Then came the tragedy. He was intoxicated by his splendid privileges; he fancied himself more than a created being; with insolent pride he claimed to be divine. The inevitable punishment followed. He had profaned what was sacred; as profane the cherub drove him out from the mountain, and he was hurled to the earth.

Certain resemblances to the Paradise story in Gen. ii. and iii. strike us at once. There is Eden, the Garden where God's Presence was near and familiar; there is an act of trangression on the part of man; and he is expelled from the Garden and prevented from returning by the cherubic sword. The main lines of the two stories are alike, but in detail the differences call for notice. In Ezekiel's version the mountain of God with its stones of fire is prominent; there dwells the cherub (in the singular) as its protecting (hassókeh) demon. Quite foreign to Genesis is the wisdom and beauty, the gorgeous apparel, of the favoured inhabitant; in Ez. he is morally "perfect" (tāmîm), in Gen. he is morally undeveloped. His sin, according to Ez. is pride aiming to be equal with God, while in Gen. it is curiosity desiring to know what was forbidden. The Dirge tells us that he was expelled by the cherub and cast down to the earth; whereas J. says that Jahweh drove out the guilty pair, and gave them a dwelling-place (*LXX*) on the E. of the Garden, and stationed (*LXX*) the Cherubim to watch the approach to the tree of life.

The mythological particulars in Ez.'s Dirge were no doubt derived from popular tradition. Several versions of the Paradise myth must have been current in Palestine from early times; two can be distinguished in J.'s narrative; Gunkel [1] finds the reminiscence of another in Job xv. 7 f., and elsewhere. These ancient myths were not of native Hebrew origin, but belonged to the common stock of Semitic tales. Some forms of them have been

[1] *Schöpf. u. Ch.*, 148.

preserved in the Babylonian epics, some in Phœnician. In Genesis they have been purged by the genius of Hebrew religion ; in Ez. the purifying process has not gone so far. While there is no reason to suppose that the prophet borrowed directly from Babylonian mythology, yet the material which he made use of contained some elements which had filtered in from Babylonia long before his time. Two or three features of the Dirge point in this direction. Most conspicuously *the mountain of God and its stones of fire*. The former is foreign to Hebrew ideas ; it is not Sinai or Zion, where Jahweh was thought to dwell ; rather it has something to do with that world-mountain, piercing into heaven, where, according to the Babylonian idea, the gods assembled to determine destinies.[1] This conception lies behind the language of Is. xiv. 12-15, a passage which is closely related to Ez. xxviii., as we shall see presently. Is. xiv. 13 places this mountain *in the recesses of the North*, in the northern heaven, where the Babylonians placed the throne of Anu, chief of the three great gods. Ez. mentions *stones of fire* as belonging to this mountain. I believe that they denote, in a concrete form, the dreadful glory of the divine above ; just as Mount Sinai " burned with fire unto the heart of heaven " (Dt. iv. 11 cp., Ex. xix. 18, xxiv. 17) ; as fired glowed and flashed beneath the throne, and the Form on the throne could only be compared to fire, in Ez.'s inaugural vision (i. 13, 27 cp., x. 27). This explanation seems to be confirmed, though the evidence comes from a much later period, by the Book of Enoch, in which the mountain-throne of God rises between six other mountains, three on each side, and all seven are encircled by burning ridges (Enoch xviii. 6-9, xxiv. 1). The *stones of fire*, then, may be pictured as the flaming ramparts which encompass the throne and presence of Deity.

It is noticeable that Ez. brings the Garden of God into relation with the mountain, at least in so far as he describes the privileged hero as dwelling in both. Hölscher indeed cuts out the reference to Eden, and cuts out also all reference to the wisdom and sanctity of the inhabitant. But there is no ground in the text or the language for supposing

[1] KAT³, 592.

that these references are later decorations. Strict consistency can hardly be expected in the details of an ancient myth; and curiously enough, the Book of Enoch again throws light on this very point. For the seven mountains are in some way connected with the Garden; they and the Garden lie in the same quarter, the Garden to the E. of them; the tree of knowledge is in the earthly Garden of Righteousness (En. xxxii. 3-6), and the tree of life is among the seven mountains (xxiv. 2-25, vi.).[1]

Besides the allusion to the mountain of God, I think that we can trace Babylonian influence in the qualities with which the denizen of the Garden is endowed: He was not only *blameless in his ways*, like Noah and Abraham in P. (Gen. vi. 9, xxii. 1, cp., Ps. xi. 2-4, ci. 2, cix. 1); but his *wisdom* and *beauty* are specially emphasized. This combination of qualities recalls, as Gunkel and Zimmern [2] have pointed out, the hero of the Adapa-myth. Ea created Adapa, a semi-divine being, with lofty virtues, and bestowed upon him in particular the gift of *wisdom*, but denied him the gift of immortality. We must be cautious here, for the Adapa-myth has nothing to do with Paradise or the first man, but is intended to teach that a mortal cannot hope to share the immortality of the gods.[3] I have said that Hölscher cancels the phrases which refer to *wisdom* in Ez.'s poem, but without any sufficient reason. It is true that in v. 12 *full of wisdom* must be omitted with *LXX* as a gloss on the preceding words *ḥôthēm taknîth*. What can they mean? *Sealing the measurement* is nonsense. Kraetzschmar suggested *ḥākām* for *ḥôthēm*. In working over the passage again for the purpose of this paper I forgot his proposal, and came independently to the conclusion that *ḥākām* is the word which we want. For *taknîth* I would suggest *taklîth* with a lamed before it: *ḥākām l'taklîth, wise to perfection* (glossed by *mātē, ḥokmāh*) will make an effective parallel to *k'lil yᵒphi*. *Wisdom* and *beauty* are combined in the passage which precedes the Dirge, v. 7, *yᵒphi ḥokmathᵉ kâ*; and later in the Dirge itself, after sin has entered, we read *shiḳāth ḥokmāthᵉ kâ* v. 17. The

[1] Charles, *Enoch*, 59.
[2] S. u. C. 148 f., KAT³, 523.
[3] Gressmann, *Esch.* 290. Jastrow, *Rel. of Bab. and Ass.* 544.

endowment of *wisdom*, then, is a point of contact between our hero of Ezekiel's myth and Adapa in the Babylonian story.

Another link is the gorgeous garment studded with gems (*'eben y'ḳârâh*) worn by the denizen of Paradise. It was the custom in Babylonia to array the statues of the gods, especially of those who were associated with light, in garments of costly stuff ornamented with precious stones, symbolising the radiant nature of the deity. An ancient Babylonian inscription, of which a copy was found in the library of Assurbanipal, records how Agum the Younger adorned the images of Marduk and his consort, Sarpanit, with splendid mantles and precious stones, of which a list is given, containing 7 or 8 names (KB. iii. 1, 140 f.).[1] In Ezekiel's description a similar list is found, with 9 names ; *LXX* gives 12 ; *S* gives 8. Now *LXX's* list corresponds exactly in order and names and number with the 12 stones on the High Priest's breastplate in Ex. xxviii. 17 ff. = xxxix. 10 ff. P. It seems that the prosaic enumeration of gems in Ezekiel has simply been taken over from the list in Ex. xxviii., with the omission of three. These nine names obviously interrupt the poetic structure of the verse, and have all the appearance of an addition made by a scribe, who borrowed the jewels from the most readily accessible quarter.

We find, then, in the allusions to the mountains of God, the wisdom of the angelic being and his gem-studded robe, features which have parallels in Babylonian mythology and custom. When we come to the tragic element in the story, analogies outside the O.T. are hard to find. Unfortunately the end of the Adapa tablet is broken off, and we do not know what happened ; but we can be tolerably sure that he failed to win immortality—*i.e.*, he was not raised to the status of the gods. Here perhaps we have something that resembles, distantly indeed, the account in Ezekiel. The hero of the Dirge, if we may so call him, committed transgression ; the glory of his favoured position fired him to grasp for more. The passage which precedes the Dirge makes it clear what the sin was : " Thou didst

[1] Meissner, *B. a. A.*, ii. 85.

say I am El, I sit in the seat of Elohim (xxviii. 2)." To Hebrew minds this was the supreme sin, the sinner was punished by degradation to the lowest depths. Something of this kind comes out in the Adapa-myth; he was denied immortality, he was not allowed to rank with the gods.

A parallel myth may be hinted at, as Gunkel thinks,[1] in Job xv. 7, 8, if we translate :—

" Wast thou the first one born a man ?
  Or wast thou brought forth before the hills ?
Didst thou listen in the Council of God ?
  And steal wisdom for thyself ? "

Gunkel understands this to be a description of the *Urmensch*, whom God admitted to the divine Council as a listener; not content, however, with so high a privilege, he aimed at a higher still, and tried to possess himself by theft of the divine wisdom. But the rendering is uncertain, owing to the ambiguity of the tenses; and to translate *wattigra*^{c} *didst steal* is to read too much into the word, which perhaps means no more than *monopolise*. The closest parallel to Ez.'s poem is the Dirge over the King of Babylon in Is. xiv. 12-15.

" How art thou fallen from Heaven,
  O shining One, son of the dawn !
' How ' art thou hewn down to the earth,
  . . . of ' all ' nations !
Thou did say in thine heart,
  Heaven will I scale ;
  Above the stars of God
  I will raise my throne,
That I may sit in the Mount of Assembly,
  In the recesses of the North :
I will ascend over the summits of the clouds,
  Will be like the Most High.
Yet to Sheol thou shalt be brought down,
  To the recesses of the Pit."

[1] L. c., 148.

The king of Babylon is compared, almost identified with the hero of some astral myth, just as in Ezekiel the King of Tyre is compared with the hero of a paradise-myth: the guilt and the punishment are alike in both cases. It is worth while to notice, in view of misconceptions, that neither in Is. xiv. nor in Ez. xxviii. is the arrogant hero identified with the *Urmensch*. The myths suggested to both prophets a comparison with the splendid and ambitious tyrants of their day.

A few words about the close of the poem. In v. 18 we read:—

> "So I will send forth a fire from the midst of thee;
> It shall devour thee.
> And I will make thee as dust on the earth,
> For all to behold thee."

Here the prophet turns from the king to the city, and predicts the ruin of Tyre itself. The first line of the verse runs: "By reason of thy manifold wickedness, and by thine infamous traffic thou hast profaned thy sanctuaries." Text and meaning are both uncertain. Even if we render *thy sanctuary* (sing.), it is curious that a Hebrew prophet should accuse a Tyrian king of defiling a heathen temple. Some of us will remember Prof. Bevan's article on this subject in *J.T.S.* iv., 1903, 500 ff. He argues that as Solomon's temple was of Tyrian workmanship, we should expect a Tyrian temple to be similar in plan and purpose; and further, since the Jewish temple by its symbolism of Cherubim, palm-trees and flowers, was brought into connection with Paradise, its prototype at Tyre must have exhibited the same associations. The argument has force; but I think it builds too much on the word *thy sanctuaries;* and whether the word is textually sound or not, the allusion comes in too late in the poem, and too incidentally, to be used as giving the key to the meaning of the whole. Cornill and others suggest the reading "thou hast profaned thy sanctity," which might refer to the "blameless" character of the inhabitant of God's garden (v. 15), or merely to his privilege as enjoying the liberties of a sacred spot. The

emendation *ḥodhsh'kâ* for *miḳdāskékā* is not, however, quite convincing; indeed, none of the attempts to alter or explain this line of v. 18, from *LXX* downwards, can be called successful.

The Dirge closes with the same refrain as the Dirge in ch. 27; and this favours the view that the whole poem is composed in the ḳînâ measure.

G. A. COOKE.

DER FRÖMMIGKEITSTYPUS DER ALTTESTAMENTLICHEN RELIGION.

In seiner " Religion der Griechen " hat Otto *Kern* erneut auf die schon früher bemerkte Parallele zwischen Hesiod und den ältesten israelitschen Schriftprofeten hingewiesen. Er hat damit ein Thema angeschlagen, das für die phänomenologische Erforschung der alttestamentlichen Religion von höchstem Interesse ist. Erlaubt es doch, die Abgrenzung des profetischen vom dichterischen Selbstbewußtsein zu vollziehen und von da zu einer Analyse der israelitischen Frömmigkeit weiter zu schreiten, deren Charakter ohne Kenntnis der Profetie dunkel bleiben muß.

Was verbindet den israelitischen Profeten und den griechischen Dichter ? Es ist *nicht nur* die Gleichheit der *Form*, daß hier wie dort die Sprache in metrischer Gliederung einherfließt, kunstvoll gestaltet zu klingendem Vers, einprägsam und die Aufmerksamkeit von Anfang an fesselnd. Es ist *nicht nur* eine allgemeine Uebereinstimmung der *sittlichen* Kampffront, aus persönlichen Erleben geboren, der Streit für die Gerechtigkeit unter den Menschen, das sich regende soziale Gewissen. Es ist *darüber hinaus* die tiefe Uebereinstimmung der *religiösen Grundüberzeugung von der Vergeltung durch den richtenden Gott*, die das Denken beherrscht, und es ist die Uebereinstimmung des Selbstbewußtseins, zur Verkündigung der Gotteskunde berufen zu sein, von dem griechischen Dichter zu künstlerisch geschautem Bilde vom Besuche der Musen gestaltet.

Aber sofort treten die Unterschiede hervor. Der *Umfang* schon der dichterischen Einheiten ist bei den ältesten Profeten *ungleich kleiner* als etwa bei Hesiod. Nur wenige

Zeilen, wenn nicht gar nur eine einzige, durch den Parallelismus der Glieder zudem in der Fähigkeit gefesselt, in knappster Form Größtes zu sagen. Wo längere Einheiten auftreten, sind sie *aus Einzelstücken zusammengefügt*, nicht immer so kunstvoll zu einer größeren Einheit innerlich zusammengeschweißt wie in des Amos erster Rede mit ihrer Zuspitzung auf Israel.

Diese Kürze der Profetenrede aber erwächst unmittelbar aus den *inneren Bedingtheiten* des in ihnen ausgeformten Erlebnisses. Es bricht mit solcher *Wucht* über den Profeten herein, auch in körperlichen Schreckreaktionen sich auswirkend, trägt so sehr den Charakter schlechterdings *übermächtiger*, mit *Zwangsgewalt* sich durchsetzender *Forderung*, daß eine *ganz andere Bindung an das Einzelerlebnis* statthat als es im dichterischen Schaffen der Fall zu sein pflegt. Der Profet steht dem Erlebnis nicht gegenüber wie der Künstler einem ihm gegebenen Stoff, den er formt, sondern wie der Knecht, der dem Worte seines Herrn Gehorsam leistet und Gehorsam bei anderen schaffen soll. Die hier vorliegenden sehr komplizierten psychologischen Vorgänge, die wesentlich im *Unterbewusstsein* sich abspielende Ausdeutung eines visionären oder auditionären Eindrucks nach bestimmten formalen und inhaltlichen Gesetzen, sind der Beobachtung durch den Profeten entzogen. Er fühlt sich an einen *von aussen gekommenen Befehl gebunden*, der an ihn nicht um seinetwillen, sondern *um der anderen willen* ergeht. *Seine* Gefühle, *sein* Innenleben ist dabei völlig bedeutungslos, soweit nicht daraus ein Versuch erwächst, den anderen den Inhalt der Botschaft zu ersparen. Denn das gilt als das Normale, daß der Profet *Künder eines Willens und eines Geheimnisses* der Gottheit ist, die ihn *in Gegensatz zu "jenem Volke da"* mit seinen stattlichen und "kirchlichen" Führern, mit seinen nationalen Plänen, Hoffnungen und Ansprüchen setzen. Ja, auch in einen *Widerstreit mit sich selbst*, denn auch der Profet hat ja teil an seines Volkes Denken und Wünschen, in einen Widerstreit, der bei den einen nur im keimhaften Ansatz, bei anderen in leidvollster Ausreifung gegeben ist, bei allen aber mit dem kampflosen oder kampfgeborenen-Sichdurchsetzen der Botschaft endet.

So hat der Profet seine " geheimen Erfahrungen " und ist doch kein in ihnen schwelgender *Mystiker*. Er kennt Gottes Geheimnisse-und grübelt dennoch nicht über Gottes *Wesen*. Er weiß Jahves Zukunftsplan-und ist doch nicht *selig* in solchem Wissen, denn dies Wissen ist *Wissen um furchtbares Leid*. Aus unmittelbarem Erleben erwächst ihm

> das Bewußtsein um seinen *Abstand von Jahve:* er der Herr, der Profet Knecht, der ihm gehorchen muß,

zugleich aber

> das Bewußtsein um das *Berufensein von Jahve:* er der Herr, der Profet *sein* Knecht, der auf *seiner* Seite steht gegen eine Welt, ja gegen die *eigene* Welt.

Dies *Doppel*bewußtsein aber *nicht* in einem zeitlichen *Nach*einander, sondern in einem festen *In*einander, dessen Doppelseitigkeit seinen spezifischen Charakter ausmacht.

Wer ist nun aber der Gott der Profeten, oder besser gesagt, welches ist der Gottesglaube, von dem aus die Deutung des Einzelerlebnisses erfolgt? Er ist den ältesten aus der *Tradition* überkommen, und ist in der *Geschichte* der Profetie mannigfach *gewandelt*, und gerade dieses Ineinander von Tradition und Eigenerleben ist für eine geistige Bewegung von solcher Lebendigkeit charakteristisch. Jahve ist zunächst und zuerst der *Gott seines Volkes*, genauer der Gott, der durch die *Erwählung* der Gott dieses Volkes *geworden* ist. Der Gott, dessen Wirken sich in der *Geschichte* abspielt, dessen Manifestation darum das *Einmalige*, das *Besondere*, das *Naturwidrige*, das " *Wunder* " ist. Denn wo urtümliches Denken Geschichtsgestaltung durch Naturgeschehen erfaßt, da sind es *nicht* die *regelmässigen* Geschehnisse, die es in ihrer alles beherrschenden Bedeutung verstünde, da sind es vielmehr die *Katastrophen*, die unerhörten und unerwarteten Vorgänge, die Widerfahrnisse, gegen die der Mensch machtlos ist. Der Gott der Profeten ist *mehr*, als der mächtige Gott dieses Volkes, und eben dieses " Mehr " gibt ihrem Abstandsgefühl seine höchste Schärfe, aber er ist dieses *primär*, und er trägt auch als der *Welten*herr die Züge, die ihm der Glaube an

seine Beziehung zu dem *einen* Volke aufgeprägt hat: *geschichts*lenkender Gott, in der Geschichte *handelnder* Gott von lebendigster Charakterbestimmtheit und lodernder Leidenschaft.

Er ist der Gott dieses Volkes, das er *jetzt verwirft*, denn aus lebendig erfahrenem Gegensatz zwischen ihm und dem Volk erwächst aktuelles, unmittelbar drohendes Unheil. Er ist der *heilige* Gott, der gefordert hat und fordert und dessen Forderung nicht erfüllt wird, vielleicht gar nicht mehr erfüllt werden *kann*, um der *Geschichte* willen nicht, die die Sünde im Volke gehabt hat. So ist der Gegensatz *nicht nur* aktuell, sondern von gestern und ehegestern, und schon längst hätte die Vernichtung einsetzen können, hätte Jahve es gewollt. Doch der *Uebermächtige* verschont den ach so *kleinen* Jakob, der *Heilige* bewingt den *Zorn*. Orge und Charis, um mit Stärk zu reden, sind die beiden Pole seines Wesens, und wo der Profet die tiefsten Blicke in Gottes Walten tut, da treten ihm diese beiden Züge zu einer Enheit zusammen in der Schau *des Willens Gottes, sich in der Welt durch Gericht und Begnadung als der Herr zu erweisen*. Der große Gedanke der Sittlichkeit der Gottheit im Sinne ihrer strafenden Gerechtigkeit verleiht zwar dem Abstandsbewußtsein seine spezifische Färbung, indem er den Abstand nicht nur als Unterschied der *Macht*, sondern als qualitativen Unterschied des Heiligen Gottes von dem unheiligen, sündigen Menschen erfährt. Aber dieser für die Geschichte der Religion so unendlich bedeutsame Gedanke hat letzlich doch nicht ausgereicht, den *Reichtum* der profetischen Gotteserfahrung zu erfassen.

Daß die Profetie mit diesem Glauben an den mächtigheiligen Gott ihres Volkes in einer *Tradition* darin steht und von dieser *Tradition* aus ihre Visionen und Auditionen deutet, wurde schon ausgesprochen. Ich muß es mir versagen, aufs neue die Linien zu zeigen, die ich an anderen Stellen glaube aufgewiesen zu haben, die Linie etwa, die vom Glaubensbegriff des Jahvisten zu dem des Jesaja hinüberläuft. Ich möchte heute vielmehr darauf aufmerksam machen, daß auch der so stark von kananäischem Wesen überwucherte *Kultus*, den die Profetie mit aller Energie als den Gegenpol des göttlichen Willens bekämpft,

dem sie die sittliche Forderung als die *einzige* Gottesforderung entgegenhält, daß auch der Kultus Züge eines analogen Frömmigkeitstypus trägt.

Der israelitische Kultus ist *reagierender* Kultus, für das Volksbewußtsein *gottgestifteter* Kultus nicht nur in dem *allgemeinen* Sinne, daß *aller* Jahvekultus in Israel in der Tatsache begründet ist, daß Jahve Israel erwählt hat und so letztlich auf den Willen Jahves zurückgeht. Sondern er ist reagierender Kultus auch in dem viel *spezielleren* Sinne daß Kultus nur an den Orten ist, an denen Jahve " ein Gedächtnis seines Namens gestiftet " hat. Das hat er nach den Legenden der Heiligtümer in der Geschichte getan, in der Zeit der Landeroberung oder der ersten Zeit des Besitzes (Jerusalemer Altar) oder aber in größerer Vergangenheit in der Zeit der Väter des Volkes (Altäre von Sichem und Bethel). *Auch der Kultus will nicht von den Menschen her, sondern will von Gott her sein.*

Der altisraelitische Kultus *lebt von dem Bewusstsein der praesentia dei* und dies Bewußtsein um die praesentia dei löst *Komplex*gefühle aus, Sehnsucht *und* Furcht, Schrecken *und* Vertrauen. Die neuesten Forschungen Sigmund Mowinckels, sowenig ich alle Einzelheiten für bewiesen ansehe, über die Spiegelung von *Festerlebnissen* in den Ausmalungen der Sinaitheophanie und über die *tōrōt*, die den Zutritt zum Heiligtum regeln, zeigen ja deutlich genug, daß in dem Kultus die *Scheu* vor dem *nahen* Gotte, dessen Kommen man doch begehrte, eine beherrschende Macht gewesen ist. Man wird das Bild des altisraelitischen Kultus nicht einseitig von der Formel von dem " Fröhlichsein vor Jahve " her entwerfen dürfen.

Dem altisraelitischen Kultus eignet ein *starker Spannungsgrad*, vor allem bei den Klagefesten. Indem das Volk für die Abwendung *konkreter* Not die göttliche Zusage im Orakel *jetzt* begehrt und erwartet, indem der Einzelne in analoger Weise auf die *aktuelle* Gottesstimme gespannt ist, die ihm Rettung und Befreiung aus Krankheit und Tod künden soll, ist eine starke Lebendigkeit gegeben, die sich in dem Anstimmen des Vertrauensmotives nach günstigem Orakel, in der drängenderen Wiederholung der Bitte bei ungünstigem Bescheide entlädt. In der leben-

digen Reaktion auf die Erfahrung der Gottesnähe in ihrer Doppelseitigkeit der Gefühlsqualität steht auch der Kultus, soweit er nicht (ich wiederhole ausdrücklich die Einschränkung) kananäisch überwuchert ist, in einem der Profetie verwandten Frömmigkeitstypus darin.

Wie stark dann *die Profetie auch in den Kultus hineingewirkt* hat, ist häufiger behandelt und neben ihrem Einfluß auf die Geschichtsbetrachtung, die Geschichtsschreibung ist ihre umgestaltende Wirkung ja in der Tat in den *Gebeten*, vor allem den Bußgebeten, der späteren Zeit deutlich genug sichtbar. So stark wir den mit Haggai, wenn nicht schon mit Ezechiel in der Profetie eintretenden Bruch empfinden, ihr Einlenken in eine Kultisches fordernde Bahn, so fremd uns, wenn wir von Amos her kommen, ein Kapitel Priesterkodex anmutet, auch der nachexilische Kultus hat seine Gestalt nicht ohne die Profetie. Bei allen primär magischen Zügen, die er darbietet, unterscheidet ihn von einem magischen Ritual das Bewußtsein um seine *Stiftung*, das Bewußtsein, in ihm einen von Gott in einem bestimmten Augenblick seinem Volke geordneten *Heilsweg* zu besitzen, durch den es dem *Zorn* entgehen kann. Die Frage nach der *geschichtlichen Richtigkeit* solchen Urteils ist für unsere phänomenologische Betrachtung bedeutungslos; für uns handelt es sich *hier* darum zu erkennen, *wie der Kultus in der Seele der Gemeinde gelebt hat.* Hier ist Opfer Gehorsam und das Opfer gut, *weil* es Gehorsam ist.

So spiegelt auch Israels *Kult*frömmigkeit das Bewußtsein um die *Geschichtsgebundenheit* der israelitischen Religion an Jahve als ihren Gott, von dem Volke aktuell Tod oder Leben zuteil wird, in Uebereinstimmung mit der Haltung, in der es ihm sich naht. So ist auch hier *lebendiges Abstandsgefühl*—er der heilige Herr—und *lebendiges Verbundenheitsgefühl*—er der Herr *dieses* Volkes, dem er nahe ist und dem er den *Heilsweg* ordnet—so ist auch hier *Abstands- und Verbundenheitsgefühl in einem, das eine nicht ohne das andere.* Schiebt sich in dem vorexilischen Kultus—ich denke etwa an das Gebet in Dtn 26—je und dann das Verbundenheitsgefühl stärker in den Vordergrund, so dringt in dem Kult der Exilszeit unter dem Eindruck der profetischen Predigt im Sündenbewußtsein und in der Ver-

zweiflung an der eigenen Fähigkeit, die Sünde zu vermeiden, das Abstandsbewußtsein stärker durch, aber nicht ohne- das ist das Entscheidende in dem stark betonten Gedanken des gottgeordneten Sühnekultus auch dem Verbundenheitsgefühl sofort gleichfalls einen verstärkten Ausdruck zu schaffen. Die für die Profetie charakteristische Färbung des Abstandsgefühls, daß der Unterschied von Gott und Mensch ein eminent qualitativer ist, hat damit auch im Kultu die beherrschende Stellung erlangt.

Die mir gesetzte Zeit erlaubt nun nicht, den analogen Tatbestand auf anderen Gebieten zu verfolgen oder das Mißverständnis abzuwehren, als sollte mit dem Gesagten die Totalität der alttestamentlichen Religion mit ihrer starken Assimilationskraft gegenüber Fremdeinflüssen erfaßt sein. Das aber muß noch ausgeführt werden, daß—auch abgesehen von dem soeben schon Angedeuteten—das Herausgehobenen *keine konstante Grösse innerhalb der alttestamentlichen Religion* gewesen ist. Findet und erwartet diese vielmehr die Manifestation Jahves als ihres heilig-erbarmenden Gottes in der Geschichte und in außergewöhnlichen seelischen Erlebnissen, so muß *die durch Geschichte und "profetisches" Erleben ausgelöste Gefühlsdoppelheit mit der Geschichte selbst sich wandeln.* Die Akzente *müssen* sich verschieben, je nachdem die Ereignisse von Huld oder Zorn der Gottheit zu sprechen scheinen, und die grundlegende Aenderung in der Lage des Volkes, sein Ausscheiden aus der Reihe der *aktiv*, nicht nur passiv an der Geschichte beteiligter Faktoren mußte sich in entscheidender Weise geltend machen. Nimmt man hinzu, daß der *Zusammenbruch des Staates mit einem Zusammenbruch des Kultus Hand in Hand* ging, und daß *der Wiederaufbau des Kultus*, soweit wir sehen können, die Symbole der aktuellen Gottesnähe und die aktuelle Gottesstimme nicht erneuert hat, daß er also *das Bewusstsein um die aktuelle Gottesnähe in den Hintergrund* schiebt, so ist auch dadurch eine Aenderung der Struktur der Frömmigkeit bedingt. Aus der Sfäre des Erlebens rückt sie stärker in die Sfäre des Glaubens, der in der *Legende* die Geschichte schafft, die er nicht mehr oder noch nicht erlebt, der *aus der Zeit in die Endzeit* weist, der *Beweis* und *Belehrung* begehrt und daher rational-

isierenden und dogmatisierenden Zügen zugänglich ist. Es ist kein Zufall, daß diese Merkmale in rascher Folge sich gegen Ende der Königszeit einstellen und daß bei Deuterojesaja der neue Typus im wesentlichen fertig da ist. *Der Wandel von ungebrochenem, aus der Gegenwart schöpfendem Erleben zum Glauben und zum Dogma* steht deutlich vor uns, zugleich aber die andere Tatsache, daß *dieser Wandel keinen absoluten Bruch* bedeutet. Auch in der älteren Zeit gab es *kein Erleben*—auch im Rahmen der Profetie nicht—*das nicht zugleich Glauben* gewesen wäre, *Deutung eines* äußeren oder inneren *Geschehens vom Glauben aus*, und es gibt nur wenige Stücke israelitischer Geschichts*überlieferung*, die nicht zugleich die *geschichtsschöpferische* und *geschichtsumbildende Wirkung des Glaubens in legendären Zügen* zeigten. Und andererseits: auch der späteren Zeit fehlt der Charakter *unmittelbaren* Erlebens nicht völlig. In der Erfassung der Natur und ihrer *regelmässigen* Erscheinungen als Manifestation des göttlichen Waltens, in der *Individualisierung* und *Verinnerlichung* des göttlichen Handelns, in dem Aufkommen *mystischer* Strömungen hat sich der *reagierende* und der *Erlebnischarakter* der israelitischen Religion erhalten und ist unter der Ritualisierung nie ganz erstickt.

Es wäre eine reizvolle Aufgabe, den Wurzeln des herausgestellten Typus nachzugehen und zu ergründen zu versuchen, wie er mit den anderen, schon gestreiften Merkmalen der israelitischen Religion, ihrer starken Assimilationskraft, innerlich zusammenhängt. Ich verzichte darauf, da ich nicht weiß, welche Gedanken mein verehrter Kollege Volz über den Gott des Moses vortragen wird. Sicher ist das eine, daß *ein* Zweig der Ueberlieferung das Bild des Moses als des Prototyp der hier skizzierten Art der Frömmigkeit gestaltet hat, als Heros der reagierenden Frömmigkeit, als Heros einer Frömmigkeit zugleich, die Furcht *und* Vertrauen in sich schließt. Und wie die israelitische Frömmigkeit stets in ihren selbstständigsten Regungen ein Ineinander von Erleben und Erlebnisdeutung von einem vorhandenen Glauben aus darstellt, wie in ihr die große Symbolwerdung der Geschichte sich immer aufs neue vollzieht, so hat die Tradition auch dem Erleben

des Moses diese Züge beigelegt. Der Gott der Väter ist mir erschienen!

> Singet dem Jah! Er erhob sich gar hoch,
> Reiter und Roß warf er ins Meer!

Hat sie recht daran getan? Stoßen wir hier auf Geschichte oder auf spätere Rücktragung? Nur darauf möchte ich verweisen, daß im Deboralied, unserer anerkannt ältesten Urkunde, der Typus, den wir verfolgt haben, ausgeprägt vor uns liegt, und daß hier die Dichtung selbst nach rückwärts weist, in die Zeit des Moses selbst hinein.

Daß dann aber der Typus *über sich selbst hinausweist* in eine Erkenntnis des Heilsweges Gottes, der nicht im gottgeordneten Kultus der Menschen, sondern in dem gottgeordneten Opfer des Einen, des Heiligen für die Menschen sich vollendet, das hat in der Welt des Alten Testamentes wenigstens der eine ganz Große gesehen, der uns den Sang der von Gottes Wunder innerlich überwundenen Heiden geschenkt hat, the Servant of the Cross.

J. HEMPEL.

LE RÔLE DES IDÉES MAGIQUES DANS LA MENTALITÉ ISRAÉLITE.

Je m'excuse de commencer par quelques remarques un peu arides, mais le mot de " magie " étant employé avec des acceptions diverses, il me paraît nécessaire pour la clarté de dire en quel sens nous le prendrons. Nous entendrons par là, conformément à l'usage courant, l'emploi de la *contrainte* pour agir sur les dieux, les esprits, les forces occultes ou l'âme des choses. En ce sens la magie s'oppose d'une part aux pratiques *propitiatoires*, qui font appel à la libre volonté d'un dieu, de l'autre aux procédés *techniques* ordinaires qui ne font intervenir aucune force invisible.

Certains historiens des religions se refusent à donner au terme de magie un sens aussi large. M. Mowinckel, par exemple, veut le réserver aux pratiques de l'individu qui utilise les forces occultes *contre les intérêts ou sans l'assentiment du groupe social*. C'est là, allègue-t-il, la distinction que les " primitifs " font entre magie et religion. Quand un primitif accomplit un rite efficace par lui-même, une ablution par exemple, mais en accord avec les coutumes de sa tribu, il n'a pas conscience de faire de la magie.

Il nous paraît cependant indispensable d'avoir un terme pour désigner d'une façon générale l'attitude psychologique consistant à essayer de contraindre les forces invisibles, aussi bien quand cet effort passe pour illicite que quand il est regardé comme légitime ; car dans les deux cas il se traduit par des paroles et des gestes tout semblables, parfois identiques. Il suffit, pour rendre justice à l'observation de M. Mowinckel, de convenir d'appeler, par exemple, *sorcellerie* le recours illicite aux forces occultes, tandis que

la magie licite peut faire partie de la *religion ;* la religion, surtout dans les temps anciens, comporte, à côté de démarches propitiatoires, beaucoup de rites efficaces par eux-mêmes, donc magiques.

Longtemps on a admis comme une sorte d'axiome que la magie occupait très peu de place dans les mœurs, les croyances et les institutions du peuple d'Israël. On estimait que les cérémonies du culte lévitique n'étaient pas conçues comme agissant *ex opere operato*, et que celles mêmes qui ressemblaient le plus à des opérations magiques (eaux de jalousie, vache rousse, bouc d'Azazel, etc.) n'étaient que des figures représentant des réalités morales, comme la repentance de l'homme et le pardon de Dieu. On interprétait les oracles mimés des prophètes commes des actes " symboliques," comme des moyens, appropriés au goût de l'imagination orientale, de frapper plus vivement l'attention des auditeurs.[1] On ne reconnaissait guère comme magiques que les pratiques des sorciers, toujours réprouvées par la Loi, et quelques superstitions populaires. Encore pensait-on que la plupart de ces " infidélités " étaient dues à des infiltrations étrangères, d'origine principalement cananéenne.

Depuis le debut du siècle surtout, de nombreux et importants travaux ont mis en lumière la parenté intime de quantité d'usages, cérémonies et croyances israélites avec les rites et notions magiques des autres peuples de l'antiquité ou des non-civilisés d'aujourd'hui. Nommons entre autres ceux de M. Friedrich Schwally sur les institutions de guerre des anciens Sémites,[2] du très regretté Hugo Gressmann sur la musique israélite et sur les traditions relatives à Moïse,[3] de MM. Hans Duhm sur les esprits mauvais dans l'A.T.,[4] Anton Jirku sur les démons et les moyens de les écarter, ainsi que sur la religion populaire israélite,[5] de Sir James

[1] C'est encore le point de vue du R. P. D. Buzy, *Les symboles de l'Ancien Testament*, Paris, Gabalda, 1923.

[2] *Semitische Kriegsaltertümer*, I., Leipzig, Dietrich, 1903.

[3] *Musik und Musikinstrumente im A. T.*, Giessen, Ricker, 1903 ; *Mose und seine Zeit*, Goettingen, Vandenhoeck et Ruprecht, 1913 ; *Die Anfänge Israels* (*Die Schriften des A. T. in Auswahl*), *ibid.*, 1912.

[4] *Die bosen Geister im A. T.*, Tubingen et Leipzig, Mohr, 1904.

[5] *Die Dämonen und ihre Abwehr im A. T.*, Leipzig, Deichert, 1912 ; *Materialien zur Volksreligion Israels*, 1914.

Frazer sur le folklore dans l'A.T.,[1] de MM. Alfred Loisy sur le sacrifice,[2] Sigmund Mowinckel sur les Psaumes et la sorcellerie,[3] Richard Kreglinger sur la magie et le rituel dans la religion d'Israël,[4] Johannes Hempel sur la bénédiction et la malédiction, Maurice A. Canney sur les donneurs de vie, la magie des pleurs, la signification des noms, etc.[5] Je me permets de mentionner aussi mes recherches sur le deuil et la consultation des morts, sur " l'ange de Yahvé," sur les idées médicales des anciens Israélites, sur leurs conceptions musicales, sur la magie hébraïque et la magie cananéenne.[6] Il paraît résulter de ces travaux qu'il faut faire intervenir les idées magiques pour expliquer non seulement quelques croyances populaires, mais certaines des institutions fondamentales de la nation.

Nous ne pouvons songer à faire ici un tableau complet des conceptions et pratiques de l'ancien Israél où semble être intervenue la magie. Nous nous proposons simplement de préciser, dans la mesure du possible, la place que cet ordre de faits a occupée dans les divers domaines de la vie de ce peuple au cours de son histoire.

I.

Une première remarque, c'est qu'il y a, en Israël comme chez les autres peuples, certaines provinces de l'activité, soit individuelle soit sociale, qui constituent pour nous des mines particulièrement riches en phénomènes relevant de la magie.

[1] *Folk-Lore in the O. T.*, 3 vols., Londres, Macmillan, 1919 ; trad. française, Paris, Genthner.

[2] *Essai historique sur le sacrifice*, Paris, Nourry, 1920.

[3] *Psalmenstudien*, I., Kristiania, Dybwald, 1921.

[4] *La religion d'Israël*, Bruxelles, Lamertin, 1922, pp. 145-168 ; 2e ed., 1926, pp. 151-174.

[5] *Givers of Life*, 1923 ; *The Magic of Tears ; The Significance of Names ; Sand in Magical and Other Ceremonies.*

[6] *La croyance à la vie future et le culte des morts dans l'antiquité israélite*, 2 vols., Paris, Fischbacher, 1906 ; *L'ange de Yahvé et " l'âme extérieure "* (*Beihefte z. ZATW*, 27, pp. 263-278, 1914) ; *Les idées des Israélites sur la maladie, ses causes et se remèdes* (*Beih. z. ZATW*, 41, pp. 181-193, 1921 ; *Les idées des anciens Israélites sur la musique* (*Journal de Psychologie*, xxiii., 1926), pp. 239-264 ; *Magie hébraïque et magie cananéenne* (*Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*, vii., 1, 1927, pp. 1-16).

I. Je ne pense pas seulement à la sorcellerie, c'est-à-dire aux emplois illicites des forces invisibles, pratiques qui devaient être fort courantes à en juger par l'insistance avec laquelle les législations successives les condamnent, et par le grand nombre des psaumes où le suppliant demande à être délivré des maléfices des *pō'ᵃle 'āwen*. Faute de pouvoir identifier sûrement tous les termes employés dans ces textes, nous ne sommes pas en mesure de nous faire une idée très précise de cette sorcellerie israélite. Nous savons, cependant, qu'elle comportait, entre autres, l'évocation des morts (ainsi I. Sam. xxviii.), la chasse aux âmes (Ez. xiii.), l'envoûtement (prob. Ez. xiii. et peut-être Ps. xxii. 17—" ils ont percé mes mains et mes pieds "), les imprécations accompagnées d'immolations (histoire de Balaam), l'emploi des noeuds (sens étymologique de *ḥōbēr ḥabārîm*), celui de la salive comme moyen de guérison (Tosefta Sanh. xii. 9, xiii. 12), du souffle pour faire disparaître la richesse d'autrui (Agg. i. 9 ; *cf.* Ps. x. 5), de certains gestes comme celui qui consiste à pointer du doigt (Es. lviii. 9 ; Prov. vi. 12-14). Les Israélites redoutaient les effets du mauvais œil (Nombres xxiii. 13 ; Cant. vi. 5 ; iv. 9 ; Prov. xxiii. 6 ; xxviii. 22 ; Matth. vi. 23 ; xx. 15 ; Mc. vii. 22 ; I. Sam. ii. 29, 31 (lxx.)). Les sorciers utilisaient la puissance que confère la connaissance des noms, spécialement des noms divins, d'où l'interdiction du décalogue : tu ne prendras pas le nom de Yahvé ton dieu, *laššāw'*, pour le mal (Ex. xx. 7). Mais la sorcellerie est loin d'être le seul domaine de la vie israélite où règnât la mentalité magique.

II. Les gestes, les attributs, les pouvoirs des hommes de Dieu, prophètes, devins, chefs politiques, ne sauraient s'expliquer sans elle. Sans doute le rôle des hommes qui prédisaient l'avenir, soit en interprétant des signes, soit par inspiration, semble, en principe, radicalement différent de celui du magicien, les premiers se bornant à prévoir des faits déterminés en dehors d'eux, principalement par la volonté divine, tandis que le magicien croyait pouvoir *agir* personellement sur les évènements futurs ; mais en fait pour les Israélites, comme pour les primitifs, la distinction était loin d'être aussi tranchée.

Élisée mourant dit au roi Joas qui était venu le visiter :

" Prends les flèches." Il les prit. Puis il dit au roi d'Israël : " Frappe à terre." Il frappa trois fois, après quoi il s'arrêta. Alors l'homme de Dieu s'irrita contre lui et dit : " Si tu avais frappé cinq ou six fois, alors tu aurais battu Aram jusqu'à l'exterminer. Mais maintenant tu le battras trois fois " (II. Rois xiii. 18-19). Evidemment les flèches divinatoires sont conçues comme agissant sur l'avenir ; il n'eût dépendu que du consultant d'obtenir un succès plus complet.

Cette façon tout à la fois de prévoir l'issue d'une guerre et de l'influencer magiquement à l'avance est courante chez les peuples les plus divers. Ainsi chez les Dacotahs, autant le chef atteint avec sa massue de cercles tracés par une magicienne, autant on tuera d'ennemis.[1]

Il est dès lors très probable *a priori* que les actes dits " symboliques " des prophètes étaient, au moins originairement, destinés à faire entrer plus efficacement dans la réalité les calamités ou les délivrances annoncées par le voyant. Il avait conscience de les accomplir sur l'ordre de Yahvé et dans le sens de la volonté divine, mais ce n'en étaient pas moins, à ses yeux et aux yeux de ses contemporains, des gestes efficaces par eux-mêmes, agissant sur les choses, et non pas seulement sur les esprits des spectateurs (ils sont parfois accomplis de nuit, sans témoin).

Une découverte faite récemment en Egypte apporte à ce point de vue une intéressante confirmation. On a acheté en 1925, et M. Sethe a publié en 1926, 289 fragments de vases et de coupes provenant apparemment d'une tombe royale de la XI[e] dynastie et sur lesquels étaient écrites à de nombreux exemplaires des listes de princes et de peuples ennemis. Les noms des ennemis égyptiens sont suivis d'une imprécation : " Qu'il meure ! " Un texte des pyramides, d'autre part, parle d'une formule à prononcer " en brisant les pots rouges " ; il est accompagné d'un déterminatif représentant un homme abattant un pilon sur une coupe.[2]

Il existait donc un rite consistant, pour assurer la mort

[1] Lang, *Mythes, Cultes et Religions*, p. 94.

[2] Kurt Sethe, *Die Aechtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf altägyptischen Tongefässen des mittleren Reiches, nach dem Originalen im Berliner Museum, herausgegeben und erklärt.* (*Abhandl. d. pr. Akad. d. Wiss. Jahrg.* 1926, *phil.-hist. Kl. Nr.* 5), Berlin, 1926, pp. 18-20.

d'un homme, à briser un vase identifié avec lui, dans le cas présent grâce à l'inscription de son nom sur l'objet. C'est le procédé employé par Jérémie pour convaincre les Juifs que Yahvé veut la ruine de Jérusalem : il brise solennellement un vase, en déclarant que c'est sur l'ordre de Yahvé. On comprend que, à la suite de ce geste, vrai acte de magie imitative d'une efficacité redoubtable, Jérémie ait été mis aux ceps par le prêtre Pachhour (Jér. xix.-xx.).

Autre exemple : lors de la bataille avec les Amalécites, Moïse, posté sur la montagne, tenait les mains levées ou, d'après une version parallèle, tenait à la main le bâton divin. Tant qu'il gardait la main dans cette position, Israël avait le dessus ; dès qu'il la laissait tomber, la victoire passait à Amleq (Ex. xvii. 8-13). Josué, de même, assura la prise d'Aï en tenant, pendant tout le combat, son javelot pointé vers la ville (Jos. viii. 18, 26). Lors de la visite de Joas à Elisée, le vieux prophète avait dit d'abord au roi de tirer une flèche par la fenêtre vers l'Est (c'est-à-dire dans la direction du pays araméen), en posant ses mains sur celles du roi. Après quoi il s'était écrié : " Flèche de victoire pour Yahvé ! Flèche de victoire sur Aram ! Tu battras Aram à Apheq jusqu'à l'exterminer ! " (II. Rois xiii. 15-17).

Nous avons là un procédé de magie couramment usité parmi les non-civilisés. Chez les Indiens de la Rivière Thompson, par exemple, quand les hommes vont en guerre, les femmes dansent en lançant au loin de longs bâtons pointus, faisant le simulacre de percer un ennemi. Les armes sont pointées dans la direction du pays ennemi.[1]

" En frottant une flèche contre une certaine pierre, l'Australien Central la charge de la puissance magique dite *Arungquiltha*, et en tirant dans la direction de l'ennemi, lorsque la flèche retombe, *l'arungquiltha* suit la tangeante et frappe l'ennemi." [2] La flèche du roi Joas avait de même été chargée de puissance spirituelle par le contact des mains de l'homme de Dieu.[3]

[1] Frazer, *Rameau d'Or*, I., pp. 29, 30 ; *cf.* autres ex. p. 27-32.
[2] Arnold van Genneys, *Les rites de passage*, Paris, 1909, p. 10.
[3] Voyez aussi la " dent spirituelle " dans Lévy-Bruhl, *L'âme primitive*, p. 218.

Si les actes, dits symboliques, des grands prophètes sont originairement des actes de magie imitative, leurs oracles contre les nations sont nés de la malédiction prononcée au début d'une campagne contre l'ennemi.

On sait le rôle que joue un peu partout le bâton ou la baguette du magicien ; cet objet renferme d'une manière toute spéciale la force spirituelle de son propriétaire comme une sorte d'âme extérieure. Elisée envoie de même poser son bâton sur le visage du fils de la Sunamite pour essayer de le ressusciter (II. Rois iv. 29, 31). Moïse, d'après le J et l'E, possédait un bâton merveilleux au moyen duquel il changea l'eau du Nil en sang (Ex. vii. 17), fendit la mer (xiv. 16), fit jaillir l'eau du rocher (Nomb. xx. 8 ss.). Le narrateur sacerdotal encore se rend si bien compte de l'identité de nature de la verge de l'homme de Dieu israélite avec celle des magiciens que, d'après lui, les enchanteurs égyptiens accomplirent avec leurs bâtons les mêmes prodiges qu'Aaron avec le sien ; ils les changèrent eux aussi en serpents. Entre eux il n'y a qu'une différence de puissance : la verge-serpent d'Aaron dévora celles des sorciers égyptiens (Ex. iv. 2-4, vii. 10 -12).

Lorsque Moïse assainit une source en y jetant un certain bois que Yahvé lui a indiqué ou qu'Elisée réalise un prodige semblable en répandant dans les eaux du sel qu'on lui a apporté sur un plateau neuf, ils accomplissent un rite efficace par lui-même : il est seulement pratiqué ici sur l'ordre ou au nom du Dieu d'Israël (Ex. xv. 25 ; II. Rois ii. 20).

Elie, d'après la forme première de la tradition, provoquait la chute de la pluie, selon le rite de magie imitative bien connu, en répandant de l'eau sur l'autel du Carmel (I. Rois xviii.).

Les chefs politiques ont pour insigne un bâton ou sceptre avec lequel ils peuvent, entre autres, creuser des puits (Nomb. xxi. 18, comp. la baguette du sourcier) ; ils ont par le fait même de leur position sociale le pouvoir de deviner (Gen. xliv. 15). Le roi est un fils de Dieu ; il a des connaissances surnaturelles comme l'ange de Yahvé. Il lui reste quelque chose des pouvoirs magiques reconnus aux chefs sur la nature ; car on le tient pour responsable de la famine

(Es. viii. 21 ; II. Rois vi. 26, 27). Il peut au besoin donner des ordres au soleil et à la lune (Jos. x. 12-14).

III. Le culte comprenait une quantité extrêmement considérable de pratiques tenues au fond pour efficaces par elles-mêmes, donc pour essentiellement magiques, bien qu'on leur donnât souvent une interprétation propitiatoire, plus respectueuse de la liberté divine. Telles sont les ablutions, qui enlèvent l'impureté ou le péché par lavage, le rituel de la fête des Expiations ou celui de la purification du lépreux qui transmet le mal ou le péché à un animal, l'évocation, prototype de la prière. Les sacrifices étaient très probablement, pour une large part, comme l'ont montré les travaux de MM. Hubert et Mauss et de M. Loisy, des rites réalisant par eux-mêmes leur objet : communion avec la divinité, revivification des choses saintes (en leur donnant du sang, principe de vie), élimination de l'esprit des récoltes (prémices), etc. . . . Pour l'ancien Israélite un culte se trouvait créé quand une divinité avait bien voulu faire connaître le lieu où elle résidait, le nom spécial et les rites particuliers par lesquels on pouvait avoir prise sur elle en cet endroit. Le culte était donc, pour l'ancien Israélite, si l'on peut s'exprimer ainsi, une sorte de magie révélée.

IV. Un autre domaine riche en pratiques d'origine magique, c'était la guerre. Les tabous qu'observait le guerrier hébreu étaient comme ceux des non-civilisés, destinés sans doute primitivement à le préserver des maléfices de l'ennemi. C'est peut-être avec la même intention qu'on oignait son bouclier (II. Sam. i. 21 ; Es. xxi. 5). Avant la campagne on cherchait, nous l'avons vu, non seulement à en prévoir l'issue, mais à agir spirituellement sur le cours de la guerre (flèches d'Elisée). Dans le même but on maudissait l'ennemi (tels Goliath et David ; *cf.* Nomb. xxi. 29) ; il y avait, à en juger par les traditions sur Balaam, des hommes doués d'un *mana* particulièrement puissant, dont c'était la spécialité et qu'on faisait venir même de l'étranger : Balaam est dépeint comme un véritable *cha'ir* arabe, à la fois poète, devin, inspiré et magicien.[1] Le chef liait à lui ses hommes par un sacrifice imprécatoire

[1] *Cf.* Causse, *Les plus vieux chants de la Bible*, p. 72.

(I. Sam. xi.). Pendant la guerre on recourait parfois au *hérem*, qui paraît avoir été à l'origine une sorte de malédiction particulièrement efficace, bien qu'on lui eût donné une couleur religieuse. L'histoire de la prise de Jéricho nous a conservé quelques uns des rites, évidemment magiques, de cette vieille institution. Après la campagne il fallait, au moyen de l'eau ou du feu, écarter de l'armée et du butin les âmes irritées des ennemis tués (Nomb. xxxi.).

V. Parmi les usages juridiques, il y en a un bon nombre qui relèvent de la magie judiciaire. L'ordalie des eaux de jalousie (Nomb. v. 11-31) est absolument du même ordre que celles qui déciment aujourd'hui encore les populations africaines. Le serment était essentiellement une malédiction éventuelle, efficace pour elle-même sans intervention nécessaire d'un dieu. Le serment était souvent renforcé par des rites de magie imitative (notamment le passage entre les morceaux d'un animal coupé en deux, ou l'entrée dans un cercle tracé sur le sol). Nommons encore le cérémonial de l'adoption, celui qui attachait à la maison l'esclave perpétuel, le gage donné à un créancier.

VI. Le cultivateur, le berger, le chasseur avaient leurs recettes et leurs tabous dont plusieurs relèvent très certainement de la magie ; défense de cuire un chevreau dans le lait de sa mère, de briser les os de l'agneau pascal, de prendre la mère avec ses petits, de mélanger les cultures. La destruction des prémices, l'immolation des premiers-nés, ont sans doute été d'abord des rites d'élimination magique. Le rite de magie imitative pratiqué, disait-on, par Élie pour amener la pluie trouva place dans le culte officiel du judaïsme à la fête des Tabernacles. C'était peut-être en vertu du même principe, comme l'a supposé M. Maurice Canney, qu'on " semait avec larmes " (Ps. cxxvi. 5, 6).[1] Onias le faiseur de pluie employait un autre procédé pour atteindre le même but : il s'enfermait dans un cercle et y faisait si l'on peut s'exprimer ainsi, la grève de la faim jusqu'à ce que Dieu fît cesser la sécheresse (rite à demi propitiatoire).

VII. De la naissance à la mort, l'individu, surtout la femme, recourait à diverses pratiques de nature magique

[1] *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, No. xii.

pour s'assurer les biens désirés ou écarter le malheur. Pour se faire aimer de quelqu'un, on lui faisait absorber certains fruits (mandragore, pommes, grenades) ou certains breuvages (*Test. xii. Patr.*, Joseph vi.). On portait certaines pierres pour se procurer la faveur (Prov. xvii. 8). On échangait armes ou vêtements pour lier son âme à celle d'un ami (I. Sam. xviii. 1). On employait les charmes et les talismans contre les morsures de serpents ou le mauvais œil. Il était important de choisir un nom efficace ou, dans certains cas, de prendre un nom nouveau, etc.

VIII. Pour lutter contre la maladie, l'ancien Israélite ne recourait guère à des recettes de thérapeutique rationelle, fondée sur l'observation (sauf pour les cas relevant de ce que nous appelons la chirurgie). Il employait surtout soit des moyens propitiatoires (prière, repentance, visite au sanctuaire, jeûne, sacrifice, vœux, consultation de l'oracle divin), soit des procédés magiques : transmission du mal à un animal, comme dans le cas du lépreux (Lév. xiv. 1-8, 49, 53), ou à l'eau d'une rivière dans laquelle le malade se plongeait (Naaman) ; expulsion du dieu auteur du mal (l'arche chez les Philistins ; imposition de la main ou du bâton d'un homme de Dieu ; contact de ses ossements (II. Rois xiii. 21). Des " prophétesses " prenaient les âmes des malades, pour les réintroduire dans leur corps. On pouvait cracher pour écarter de soi le mal, utiliser la vertu des couleurs ou celle des images prophylactiques, changer le nom, etc.

IX. Rappelons enfin qu'un grand nombre des usages du deuil avaient originairement pour but d'empêcher l'esprit du mort de revenir ou son influence de s'attacher aux vêtements ou au corps, spécialement aux cheveux des assistants, ou de s'insinuer dans les aliments ou breuvages qui se trouvaient dans la maison mortuaire. D'autres visaient, peut-être, à tromper l'esprit du défunt.

Cette simple énumération (qui est certainement très loin d'être complète ; car la plupart des traits cités ne nous sont connus que par des allusions occasionnelles) suggère déjà que l'élément magique jouait un rôle considérable dans la vie de l'ancien Israélite.

II.

Mais une autre observation montrera mieux encore combien cette conclusion s'impose. C'est qu'un large recours à la magie était la conséquence à peu près inévitable de la mentalité générale des Israélites. Celle-ci, en effet, était encore dans une large mesure, à l'époque historique, semblable à cette " mentalité primitive " qui a été, dans ces derniers temps étudiée d'une manière si pénétrante, notamment par M. Lévy-Bruhl.[1]

Il suffira ici de relever trois traits de cet état d'esprit.

I. Quiconque a été en contact avec des non-civilisés a remarqué combien ils sont réfractaires à l'observation et à l'expérience, même dans ce qu'elles ont, à nos yeux, de plus élémentaire. Ils expliquent presque tout non par des causes naturelles, mais par l'intervention de quelque force invisible : si le breuvage fabriqué par le sorcier fait périr ceux qui l'absorbent, ce n'est pas que cette liqueur soit un poison, c'est que le magicien y a enfermé une force qui tuera l'homme auteur d'un maléfice, et celui-là seulement. Si un crocodile entraîne dans le fleuve quelque villageois, ce n'est pas que le crocodile soit un animal féroce, c'est que ce villageois avait été " livré " par un sorcier ou un esprit. Comme le dit M. Lévy-Bruhl, " c'est avant tout de la force, ou des forces mystérieuses, invisibles, partout répandues que dépend la réussite ou l'insuccès à la chasse, à la pêche, dans la culture des plantes, et, en général, dans toutes les entreprises où l'indigène s'engage." [2] Ce sont ces puissances qu'il importe avant tout de se rendre favorables (par des moyens propitiatoires) ou bien de dompter ou d'écarter de force (par des procédés magiques).

Cet état d'esprit était aussi celui des Israélites. La maladie, par exemple, était en général attribuée soit à Yahvé, soit à une autre puissance invisible, subordonnée au Dieu national ou hostile (à l'exterminateur, à un démon comme celui de la lèpre, à la maladie personnifiée (Os. xiii. 14 ; Deut. xxviii. 22 ; Job xviii. 13 ; Ps. xci. 5-6 ; Lév.

[1] *Les fonctions mentales dans les sociétés inférieures ; La mentalité primitive ; L'âme primitive* (Paris, Alcan, 1927).

[2] *L'âme primitive*, p. 8.

xxvi. 16), à l'action d'un astre comme la lune), soit encore aux maléfices d'un homme, notamment à une malédiction (II. Sam. iii. 29 ; Ps. lxix. 24, 26, 29 ; cix. 8-9, 13, 17-20 ; Job xxxi. 30 ; II. Rois v. 27 ; Ex. ix. 9-12 ; Nomb. v. 21, 22, 24, 27, etc.). On comprend dès lors pourquoi, en cas de maladie, les Israélites et après eux les Juifs recouraient de préférence soit à des moyens propitiatoires agissant sur Yahvé, soit à des recettes magiques éliminant les puissances mauvaises, et négligeaient comme inutile ou condamnaient même comme impie le recours à la médecine expérimentale.

Le succès ou l'échec des opérations militaires était expliqué de même. La victoire dépend beaucoup moins de l'habileté des chefs ou du grand nombre des troupes que de l'intervention de Yahvé,[1] qui a ou n'a pas à l'avance " livré " les ennemis entre les mains des siens (Jos. x. 8 ; Jug. xiii. 1), les a ou ne les a pas " battus devant Israël " (Jug. xx. 35 ; I. Sam. iv. 3). Le résultat de la guerre dépend aussi (bien que les textes en parlent beaucoup plus rarement) de l'action des puissances invisibles qui protègent l'adversaire : Israël, Juda et Edom durent battre en retraite parce que Camoš était très irrité contre eux (II. Rois iii. 27) ; les Cananéens seront vaincus parce que " leur ombre s'est éloignée d'eux " (Nomb. xiv. 9). Nous tenons là l'une des raisons de l'hostilité que les grands prophètes (spécialement Osée et Esaïe) et après eux les hasidim et les pharisiens nourrissaient pour les armements : si c'est Yahvé qui donne la victoire (on disait " la délivrance "), ce ne sont pas les armes humaines ; si ce sont les armes, ce n'est pas Dieu. L'intervention de la cause première leur paraissait exclure celle des causes secondes.

Un passage de Jérémie est caractéristique à cet égard. C'est dans une prière à l'occasion d'une sécheresse :

> Parmi les vanités (c.-à-d. les dieux impuissants) des nations, y en a-t-il un qui fasse pleuvoir ?
> Ou bien est-ce le ciel qui donne les averses ?
> N'est-ce pas toi, Yahvé notre Dieu (xiv. 22).

[1] Ainsi, Ps. xx. 8-9. De même chez les Egyptiens : prière de Ramsés II. à Amon, Maspero, *Hist. anc. des peuples de l'orient classique*, II., 395-398.

Si c'est le ciel qui fait tomber la pluie, ce n'est pas Yahvé qui en est l'auteur. Et si c'est Yahvé (comme tout Israël en est persuadé), il s'ensuit que ce n'est pas le ciel. Du moment que la cause première importe seule, force est bien de recourir soit à la propitiation soit à la magie.

II. Le second trait que nous voudrions relever dans la mentalité des " primitifs," c'est qu'ils ne font pas la distinction du spirituel et du matériel, ou du moins ne la font pas de la même manière que nous. Sans doute les causes premières dont ils voient partout l'action, sont, selon eux, des principes analogues au principe de vie qui anime l'homme, donc à ce que nous appelons l'esprit. En ce sens les non-civilisés sont spiritualistes au plus haut degré, puisqu'ils voient partout des esprits ou de l'esprit. Mais d'autre part, ils ne conçoivent pas ce qui est spirituel, idéal, comme réellement différent de ce qui est matériel et tangible. L'esprit qui anime l'homme, celui qui constitue la substance des démons et des dieux, le *mana* du sorcier, sont des éléments matériels, d'une matière très subtile sans doute, ténue, volatile, mais qui peuvent dans certaines circonstances être perçus par les sens. Comme a dit M. Lévy-Bruhl,[1] " la mentalité primitive . . . sent tous les êtres comme homogènes. Aucun n'est pure matière, encore moins pur esprit. Tous sont des corps ou ont des corps, et tous possèdent, à des degrés divers, les propriétés mystiques que nous reconnaissons aux seuls esprits."

Les qualités, mêmes celles que nous appelons morales, sont des choses matérielles, dont on peut se débarrasser par un lavage ou en passant par une étroite ouverture ; il est possible de les transmettre à autrui ou de les acquérir par contact.

Ces conceptions étaient celles des anciens Israélites. L'âme du défunt,—ou l'influence émanant de lui,—peut, selon eux, s'introduire dans un vase si celui-ci n'a pas de couvercle, s'insinuer dans les pores d'un vase d'argile, s'attacher aux cheveux ou aux vêtements, pénétrer les aliments qui se trouvent dans la maison mortuaire. On peut prendre dans un piège l'âme des vivants (Ez. xiii.) ; on peut empêcher celle des morts de vagabonder en dressant

[1] *L'âme primitive*, p. 25.

sur le cadavre un tas de pierres ou en couvrant de terre le sang, qui est non seulement le siège de l'âme, mais en un sens l'âme elle-même.

La sainteté et l'impureté étaient conçues comme des sortes de fluides qui pénètrent les objets et les personnes se trouvant en contact avec certains lieux ou certains objets. Les vêtements avec lesquels les prêtres ont officié doivent être enfermés dans le parvis intérieur de peur de sanctifier le peuple (Ez. xliv. 19).

La péché, de même, s'attache à l'autel et au sanctuaire.

Un simple regard établit une contagion aussi effective, aussi matérielle que le toucher. Quiconque a *vu* un elohim mourra infailliblement (à moins d'une faveur exceptionelle). Pour s'être retournée et avoir aperçu le châtiment divin de Sodome, la femme de Lot fut atteinte aussi par la catastrophe.

L'une des conséquences nécessaires de cette indistinction du spirituel et du matériel, c'est qu'on peut employer des moyens physiques, opérant par contrainte, donc des moyens magiques pour agir sur les dieux ou les esprits, pour acquérir une qualité morale ou religieuse ou pour s'en débarrasser. Cette conséquence était familière aux Israélites. De là les nombreux rites de contagion ou d'élimination que nous avons signalés au passage : rites des eaux de jalousie où la femme absorbait la malédiction avec l'eau sainte ; transmission de l'esprit ou d'une charge par imposition des mains ; élimination du mal par exécution de l'homme ou de l'animal maléfique ; explusion du dieu auteur du mal ou de l'animal à qui on l'a transféré ; transfusion du péché à un bouc ou bien à un homme qui en supportera les conséquences à la place du coupable. On peut faire fuir les esprits en produisant une fumée nauséabonde (Asmodée dans Tobit) ou en faisant un bruit qui les effarouche (clochettes du grand prêtre)

D'autre part on peut employer des moyens que nous appellerions spirituels, mais qui agiront eux aussi par contrainte, parce qu'ils sont conçus comme matériels. De là l'efficacité quasi physique reconnue à la parole ; par le seul fait qu'elle a été prononcée, elle agit comme une flèche qu'on a tirée. Non seulement Yahvé crée les choses

et les êtres par une parole, non seulement le prophète détruit ou relève effectivement des royaumes par le fait qu'il annonce leur ruine ou leur restauration (Jer. i. 10), mais tout homme peut faire de même, spécialement en prononçant les formules de bénédiction ou de malédiction ; nul (pas même celui qui les a lancées) n'en peut arrêter les effets. Quand on salue quelqu'un, on lui donne effectivement de la " paix." Cette efficacité prêtée à la parole s'étend aussi à la parole écrite : des textes de l'Écriture enfermés dans des capsules deviennent de véritables talismans protecteurs (phylactères, mezouza).

Le regard étant équivalent à un contact véritable, l'homme malintentionné peut s'en servir pour faire pénétrer ses maléfices dans les objets ou les personnes qu'il fixe : de là la croyance au mauvais œil. Balaam est mené sur une montagne pour voir au moins une partie du peuple qu'il doit maudire (Nomb. xxiii. 13). On peut se servir de ce contact établi par le regard dans la magie curative : les Israélites mordus par les seraphim n'ont qu'à jeter les yeux sur le serpent de bronze pour être guéris (Nomb. xxi. 9).

Un geste de la main suffit à l'homme doué de quelque pouvoir spirituel pour lancer ce pouvoir dans telle direction qu'il lui plaît. Le méchant étend le doigt en disant des sortilèges (*'āwen*) (Es. lviii. 9).[1] If fait des signes avec les doigts (Prov. vi. 12-14). Pointer du doigt passait chez les Arabes pour un geste maléfique ; il est interdit par l'Islam.[2]

Le simple fait de désirer le bien d'autrui, ou seulement d'en faire l'éloge, est considéré par beaucoup de primitifs comme positivement nuisible.[3] C'est peut-être au fond pour cela que la convoitise est condamnée dans le décalogue sur le même pied que l'assassinat le vol, ou l'adultère.

[1] Mowinckel, *Ps-stud.* I. 8, 16, 20, 25.
[2] Guidi, *L'Arabie préislamique*, 1921, p. 40.
[3] Ainsi C. W. Hotley, *Further Researches into Kikuyu and Komba Religious Beliefs and Customs, J. A.*, I., 41, p. 433, dans Lévy-Bruhl, *La mentalité primitive*, p. 401 ; Mgr. Leroy, *La religion des primitifs*, p. 299 (cité par Causse, *Les plus vieux chants de la Bible*, p. 117, Note 3).

" Celui qui profère contre nous un mauvais sort, qu'il meure !
Celui qui dit : ce village est riche, ses hommes sont nombreux,
Celui qui parle ainsi est un jaloux, qu'il meure ! "

II. Nous voudrions encore attirer l'attention sur un troisième trait de la mentalité primitive. Le primitif paraît ignorer le principe de contradiction. Il admet qu'une chose soit à la fois ceci et autre chose, qu'un événement soit à la fois présent et futur, passé et actuel, qu'un homme vivant dans son village soit en même temps un tigre rôdant dans la jungle, qu'une personne se trouve simultanément en plusieurs lieux différents. Il croit qu'il y a sympathie et au fond identité entre une foule de choses ou d'êtres à nos yeux nettement distincts, par exemple entre le présage et le malheur présagé ; si on réussit à tuer l'oiseau de mauvais augure, on annule la calamité annoncée elle même. Il y a pour lui sympathie et au fond identité entre une personne et ce qui tient à elle de quelque manière (ses vêtements, ses armes, ses rognures d'ongles ou ses cheveux coupés, son nom, son portrait, sa trace), entre les membres d'un même groupe social, entre êtres ou choses qui se ressemblent de quelque façon.

Des faits nombreux et bien connus montrent que les Israélites ont cru à ces " participations," comme on a proposé de les appeler, à cette quasi identité entre personnes ou choses différentes selon nous : solidarité entre membres du même clan ou du même peuple, entre le père et le fils, spécialement entre la mère et son enfant (de là les abstinences imposées à la mère—et peut-être au père—de Samson ; défense de faire cuire un chevreau dans le lait de sa mère, etc.), entre deux amis intimes (leur âme est liée, Gen. xliv. 30 ; I. Sam. xviii. 1), entre Yahvé et " son ange " ; solidarité entre un événement et le lieu ou le jour où il s'est accompli (de là les malédictions de David contre la montagne de Guilboa (II. Sam. i. 21), celles de Jérémie et de Job contre le jour de leur naissance), entre un fait et le présage qui l'annonce : des oiseaux de proie s'étant abattus sur les victimes du sacrifice d'alliance, Abraham réussit à atténuer ce présage funeste en chassant les bêtes de mauvais augure (Gen. xv. 11, 14). Le prophète Sédécias fils de Kenaana se fait des cornes de fer, et dit au roi d'Israël : " *avec ces cornes* tu heurteras Aram jusqu'à l'anéantir " (I. Rois xxii. 11). Même identité foncière entre un événement et le récit qui en est fait ; David met à mort le mes-

sager qui lui apporte la nouvelle du désastre de Guilboa (II. Sam. iv. 10). Un homme de bien ne peut transmettre que de bonnes nouvelles (II. Sam. xviii. 27, *cf.* 19-23).

L'Israélite admettait, de même, une participation entre la personne et ses " appartenances," notamment ses vêtements, ses armes, sa canne, son cachet. Et c'est peut-être ainsi que s'explique, entre autres, l'interdiction des travestissements (Deut. xxii. 5). D'après les croyances de certains primitifs, si une femme met les vêtements d'un homme, elle s'expose à devenir enceinte de cet homme, et un homme qui prend le costume d'un femme commét adultère avec cette femme.[1]

Grâce à ces multiples " participations," l'Israélite pensait posséder—comme le non-civilisé d'aujourd'hui—toute sorte de moyens efficaces d'agir sur les choses, les gens et les forces invisibles.

De ces moyens les uns utilisent le lien qu'on admettait entre les semblables (c'est la *magie imitative*) : rites de pluie, actes prophétiques, serments ou malédictions mimés (par exemple le passage entre les morceaux d'un animal identifié au jureur ; vêtements secoués), circumambulation (Jéricho), utilisation des noeuds, des images pour envoûter un ennemi (on a trouvé des figurines de plomb aux membres liés de fil métallique, ayant servi à cet usage, dans les fouilles de Sandahanna) ;[2] emploi prophylactique des images (statues de souris ou de bubons (I. Sam. vi.), du Nehouštân). La couleur bleue protège contre le mauvais œil parce que l'œil bleu, étant rare en Orient, passe pour particulièrement redoutable. Le rouge est très efficace parce que c'est la teinte du sang. On jettera du sel, soit pour assainir une source (parce que le sel préserve de la corruption), soit pour réduire un pays en désert—plus précisément : en une plaine salée par magie imitative—etc. . . .

D'autres pratiques mettaient à profit la solidarité qui existe, pensait-on, entre la partie et le tout (c'est la *magie sympathique*) : offrande de cheveux à un mort, remise à un créancier d'un manteau, d'une canne ou d'un cachet,

[1] Levy-Bruhl, *L'âme primitive*, pp. 137, 138.
[2] F. J. Bliss, *Pal. Expl. Fund*, 1902, 154 ; *Quart. Stat.*, 1900, 332-334, *cf. Rev. d'Hist. et de Phil. rel.*, vii., 12-14.

don d'armes ou de vêtements à un ami intime (Jonathan), pratiques multiples utilisant l'identité de la personne et de son nom. L'homme qui pose le premier le pied sur une terre ou dans une ville se crée par là des droits sur cette terre ou cette ville (Caleb, Othniel) ; car par ce geste il y a mis quelque chose de lui-même. De là la nécessité d'employer dans beaucoup de rites magiques ou cultuels des objets n'ayant jamais servi—plateau neuf d'Elisée (II. Rois ii. 20), génisse n'ayant jamais travaillé (Deut. xxi.), etc. Rappelons enfin, pour clore sur un fait moins connu, qu'une croyance très répandue veut que la vie et la destinée d'un enfant soient liées à celle d'une plante mise en terre le jour de sa naissance. L'arbre communique par sympathie à son jumeau humain quelque chose de sa vigueur ; mais si la plante vient à mourir, l'enfant périt aussi. Or cette croyance existait dans le judaïsme, du moins à une époque assez basse. D'après une légende rabbinique la grande révolte juive sous Hadrien (135 après J.-C.) fut provoquée par des Romains qui, pour réparer une litière, brisèrent un arbre planté à la naissance d'un enfant.[1]

III.

Il resterait à faire une histoire de la magie dans l'ancien Israël. Bornons nous à en tracer une esquisse très sommaire.

Les idées magiques, nous venons de le montrer, tenaient étroitement au fond même de la mentalité israélite. Elles ont dû y former *en tout temps* une sorte de couche sous-jacente, qui a persisté même aux époques les moins favorables à la magie, comme elles subsistent encore aujourd'hui au fond de l'esprit des peuples les plus civilisés. Mais il y a eu sans doute, au cours des âges, des variations notables dans l'importance reconnue aux idées de cet ordre et des nuances entre les aspects divers sous lesquels elles se présentaient.

Elles devaient être courantes au stade nomade. Un des plus vieux poèmes hébreux qui nous aient été con-

[1] b. Guittin 55[b] (*cf.* Lagrange, *Messianisme*, p. 311.

servés fait allusion à la vertu magique des sceptres des chefs, qui servaient à creuser les puits. Le *hérem*, très antique institution sémitique, était probablement, nous l'avons indiqué, une vieille forme de malédiction. L'oasis de Qadesh, qui fut longtemps le centre des tribus hébraïques nomades, possédait des sources dont les eaux, à en juger par leurs noms, servaient à des ordalies judiciaires, rites originairement magiques : " eaux de Meriba," c'est-à-dire du procès, de " Massa," c'est-à-dire de l'épreuve, " source du jugement " (Gen. xiv. 7).

L'état d'esprit des Hébreux nomades devait être à peu près celui des Arabes préislamiques ou des Bédouins actuels.

Lors de leur entrée en Palestine, les Israélites empruntèrent à coup sûr aux Cananéens bien des pratiques magiques, leurs rites agraires, par exemple, et divers usages du culte. Mais ces emprunts ne firent certainement qu'enrichir un trésor de recettes magiques déjà existant.

Cependant la religion nationale de l'ancien Israël, considérée dans son ensemble, ne faisait qu'une place relativement restreinte à la magie et à la lutte contre la sorcellerie. Il est facile de voir la raison de ce fait : la religion d'Israël reconnaissait à Yahvé un rôle très personnel et une liberté souveraine : de là, par exemple, le fait que, dans les textes anciens, les sacrifices sont presque toujours présentés comme un don essayant d'influer sur la libre volonté de Dieu, et non pas comme un acte efficace par lui-même. D'autre part l'ancien Israël n'hésitait pas à rapporter à son Dieu national l'origine de tout ce qui est, même du mal, voire, à l'occasion, du mal moral (Yahvé pousse David à faire un dénombrement, II. Sam. xxiv. 1 ; le même David admet que Yahvé ait excité Saül contre lui, I. Sam. xxvi. 19) ; Israël était donc moins porté que d'autres peuples de l'antiquité (les Babyloniens, par exemple) à admettre l'intervention des démons et l'action des maléfices humains.

Les grands prophètes, à partir du VIII^e^ siècle, en exaltant au delà de toute mesure la puissance de Yahvé et en insistant exclusivement sur le caractère moral de ses exigences inaugurèrent une religion foncièrement étrangère et hostile à toute magie. Dieu seul dirige souverainement tous les événements ; les hommes ne peuvent agir sur lui que par

leur obéissance à sa volonté de justice et d'amour. Cette répudiation de toute magie est certainement une des raisons profondes de l'hostilité des prophètes contre le culte et contre les images, bien qu'ils ne se soient jamais expliqués clairement sur le pourquoi de leur attitude. Dans un passage cependant Jérémie paraît nier la valeur expiatoire des sacrifices ; c'est lors qu'il dit à Jérusalem :

> Les voeux et la chair sainte
> feront-ils passer de dessus toi ta méchanceté ?
> Alors tu pourrais te réjouir (xi. 15 texte corrigé d'après lxx.).

Cette opposition à l'esprit magique s'atténua considérablement à l'époque exilique et postexilique, lorsque le groupe prophétique adopta le culte purifié du temple de Jérusalem. La science sacerdotale du sacré et du profane, du pur et de l'impur, codifiée dans la législation lévitique, donna droit de cité dans la religion officielle du judaïsme à une foule d'éléments originairement magiques. Il y a cependant une nuance entre ce ritualisme lévitique et la conception ancienne : les usages traditionnels, souvent incompris, intéressent desormais moins pour eux-mêmes que parce qu'ils sont prescrits par Yahvé et parce qu'ils servent d'armure préservatrice à la religion nationale.

De plus cette reprise des idées magiques fut, en partie, neutralisée, du moins dans les classes cultivées, par le moralisme rationaliste né du mouvement prophétique. Ainsi l'auteur du livre dit de Malachie, bien que très attaché au culte et à ses rites, n'a, semble-t-il, aucun sens de la portée mystique, sacramentelle du sacrifice : il l'assimile prosaïquement au bakchich qu'on offre au satrape pour se faire bien venir de lui (i. 8, 9). Certains sages ne croient plus à l'efficacité absolute de la malédiction : elle ne se réalise que si elle est méritée :

> Comme un oiseau qui s'échappe,
> comme une hirondelle qui s'envole,
> Ainsi en est-il de la malédiction gratuite :
> elle ne se réalise pas (Prov. xxvi. 2).

Le Siracide assimile la malédiction à une prière que Dieu peut exaucer ou ne pas exaucer (xxxiv. 29) :

L'un bénit, l'autre maudit :
Duquel le Seigneur écoutera-t-il la voix ?

Dans les milieux populaires, au contraire, la mentalité magique subsistait. Elle donna même naissance à des pousses nouvelles. Témoin le livre de Tobit et la recette indiquée pour faire fuir le démon Asmodée jusqu'en Haute Egypte (brûler le foie d'un poisson), témoin encore les vertus apotropéiques prêtées aux phylactères et à la mazouza.

A partir du deuxième siècle avant J. C., les croyances et pratiques magiques se développèrent et gagnèrent (ou regagnèrent) les classes instruites. Le peuple juif, déçu dans ses espérances grandioses de domination universelle, en venait de plus en plus à la conviction que le monde présent était l'empire de puissances mauvaises, des démons ou de Satan : d'où le développement considérable pris alors par la démonologie et, par suite, par la magie pour écarter les esprits funestes. Le contact avec le monde hellénistique n'était pas fait pour contrecarrer cette tendance : en même temps qu'au rationalisme philosophique et scientifique, la société gréco-orientale accordait un large crédit à l'occultisme, aux rites réputés efficaces (mystères), à la sorcellerie.

Un passage des *Testaments des XII. Patriarches* montre bien quelle était alors dans ce domaine l'attitude des plus pieux parmi les Juifs. Joseph y raconte que la femme de Potiphar lui envoya des " aliments mêlés de sortilèges," " pour séduire son âme," c'est-à-dire évidemment pour se faire aimer de lui. Lorsque l'eunuque lui apporta ce mets, Joseph reçut de Dieu une vision : il vit un homme d'aspect terrible qui lui tendait une épée avec le plat. Il refusa donc d'en manger parce que cet aliment était " rempli de mort." Il finit cependant par le prendre pour convaincre l'Egyptienne que " la méchanceté des impies ne peut rien contre ceux qui craignent Dieu avec chasteté " (*Test. Joseph* vi.).

L'auteur croit donc fermement à l'efficacité redoubtable

des philtres ; mais il est persuadé qu'il existe une puissance supérieure, celle de Dieu, qui peut en délivrer le Juif fidèle.

Il est grand temps de conclure ce trop long exposé. Il en ressort, me semble-t-il, que la magie tenait une place relativement importante, plus importante qu'on ne le dit d'ordinaire, dans le vieux fonds d'idées et de croyances des tribus hébraïques. Les forces propres à la religion nationale d'Israël, notamment le prophétisme, ont réussi à transformer profondément cette matière première, à en éliminer, en particulier, dans une large mesure, le virus magique, pour constituer la religion la plus élevée qu'ait connue l'antiquité. Mais pour expliquer les formes et les institutions de cette religion, il faut naturellement tenir grand compte de l'état qu'elle a voulu réformer, et qu'elle n'a, du reste, jamais aboli entièrement.

A. LODS.

DEUTERONOMY.

THE text of Deuteronomy must have a rather long history. It took at least about 200 years to shape it into its present form. The starting point was the middle of the seventh century B.C., but the book, as we know it, can not have existed before the period that followed Nehemiah.

The original text of the book gave rise to a good many learned remarks, and also to a number of sermons that were intended to be read either as an introduction or as a conclusion to the official recital of the law in the temple of Jerusalem at the feast of tabernacles in every eighth year (Deut. xxxi. 10).

It seems that all those texts were written in the margins of the columns of the book-roll, after the oriental fashion of dealing with manuscripts. Hence they were incorporated in the text of the book by copyists.

The commentative notes are frequent in the first eleven chapters. They are ii. 10-12 ; ii. 15 ; ii. 20-23 ; iii. 9-11 ; iii. 13*b*, 14, 16, 17 ; iv. 41-43 ; iv. 46*b*-49 ; x. 6-9 ; xi. 30. Some of them intend to give a better understanding of the historical events, mentioned in the book, and give fuller details derived from the current traditions. We regard as such iii. 23-28 ; ix. 9-21, and x. 10, 11 ; ix. 25-29 ; x. 1-6.

In a single case the old text is partly omitted and replaced by a new one, that better met the then existing situation than the original text did. We expect after iv. 28 threat and punishment. The promise of iv. 29*b*-40 now encourages the exiles to new hope and is inconsistent with the general bearing of the address in Ch. iv.

Chapters xxviii., xxix., and xxx. are sermons. The history of Moses, xxxi. 14 ; xxxiv. 12, is probably added

by the redactors of the Pentateuch who gave to it its final form.

We further find insertions that must have found their origin in the controversies between the priests that officiated in Juda in the fifth century B.C.

We learn from Nehemiah that the high priests of this period and the free Jewish landed proprietors appreciated living in peace and harmony with the non-Jewish population of the district (Neh. vi. 17-19 ; xiii. 4, 5). The efforts of Ezra and Nehemiah to free Israel from relationship with them, principally met with the approval of the priests, but practically many of them were inclined to let things remain as they were. They were even prepared to restore the former situation as soon as Nehemiah had returned to Persia, notwithstanding their oaths, given in his presence. Those who sympathised with Nehemiah met with serious antagonism from the side of their opponents. In one instance this even led to murder. The high-priest Johanan killed his brother Joshua in the temple. Consequently his name is omitted in the official list of high-priests (Neh. xii. 10, 11). The casual reference to him (Neh. xii. 23), and the letter, addressed to him by the Jews of Elefantine, show that he was in office in the last part of the fifth century.

A priest, who was on friendly terms with the " Samaritans " and their temple in Mount Gerizim, took the liberty of introducing the Gerizim in the text of Deuteronomy xi. as a proof of the sanctity of the place. He found no better way than writing an addition to the end of the address of Moses in xi. 26, " Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse," in which he stated that the blessing would be placed on Mount Gerizim and the curse upon Mount Ebal.

This curious addition gave considerable trouble to some readers, who tried in vain to give an explanation of its meaning. Other readers understood the command to set up great stones and to build an altar immediately after the passage of Jordan (evidently near Gilgal) as a reference to another Gilgal near Gerizim. They asserted the blessed character of Mount Gerizim by inserting a command to

set up the great stones, on which the law was engraved, in Mount Ebal (xxvii. 4 and 8).

The result of all this is a great confusion of texts in chapter xxvii., which already existed when the narrative in the book of Joshua was written. Joshua viii. 32 is based on the present text of Deut. xxvii. 1-8. The note, xxvii. 4, 8, was divided by a copyist in two parts. The first part found its place between v. 3 and v. 5, the second between v. 7 and v. 9. The result is that the present text seems to command that a copy of the law is to be engraved on the unhewn stones of the altar, mentioned v. 5 and 6. Now, Joshua viii. 32 informs us that this impossibility was actually fulfilled.

Another instance of additions, made in this period, is Deut. xxiii. 4-7. Here the Moabites and Ammonites are excluded for ever from the assembly of the Lord. This judgment disagrees with the appreciation of them in chapter ii.

The original book contained i.-xxvi. ; xxviii. 69 ; xxxi. 1-13. It was written in the form of an address of Moses to the tribes that were assembled in the land of Moab, intending to cross Jordan near Jericho.

Many scholars feel inclined to suppose that the book is a combination of two works, one of which used the singular form of the second person, while the other one addressed the people with the plural form. Close examination of the texts shows that this theory is highly improbable. In a great number of verses the plural and singular form are used at the same time without affording any ground for the theory that they are composed by a redactor.

See *e.g.* i. 21-31 ; ii. 6-7, 24, 25 ; iv. 9, 10, and 11 sqq. ; iv. 19, 20 ; vi. 16-18 ; vii. 8, 25 ; viii. 1, 19 ; ix. 7 ; x. 15 ; xi. 8, 10, 14, 19 ; xii. 1, 9 ; xiii. 1, 3, 4, 6, 8 ; xxvii. 2, etc., etc.

Some of the notes differ from the context in the use of the singular or plural form of the second person. But there is no internal connection between them, and they cannot be explained as parts of a separate work. (*f.i.* iv. 29*b*-40 ; v. 2-4 ; xxvii. 4, etc.)

The first part of this speech admonished the people to

be obedient to the law of the Lord, and warned them especially against making of images and adoration of the sun, the moon, and the stars (iv. 16, 19). The wonderful help of the Lord in destroying the powers of Hesbon and Bashan, and his wrath because of Baal-Peor are quoted as arguments for obedience and confidence in the future. In the beginning of this address Moses remembered that he had commanded them all they should do before they journeyed from Horeb (i. 18). This part is concluded, iv. 44, by the words, "This is the Thora which Moses set before the children of Israel."

The second part of the address repeats the older legislation that was given in order to enable the judges, who were appointed as assistants to Moses, to give their decisions (i. 15). This part is opened by the words of iv. 45, "This is the Eduth and the statutes and the judgments, which Moses spake unto the children of Israel when they came forth out of Egypt."

This second part (iv. 45—ch. 26) is not a mere repetition of the older collection of laws. It brings also back to memory the events at Mount Sinai and emphasizes that the people itself heard the words of the Eduth (the ten commandments), spoken by the Lord out of the midst of fire, and instantly given by him to Moses, written upon two tables of stone (v. 22). Moses alone heard the further commandments, as the people was in fear of death.

The order of events related here is different from the narrative in Exodus. In Exodus the law, written on the two tablets of stone, was a legislation of considerable length (Ex. xxiv. 12; xxxii. 15), and was received by Moses after staying on Mount Sinai during 40 days and 40 nights.

In chapters vi., vii., and xi. 1-2*d*, we find exhortations to obedience and encouragement for the forthcoming conquest of Canaan. Here also the wonderful help of the Lord is used as argument for confidence and courage, but this help is only illustrated by what the Lord did unto Pharaoh (vi. 20; vii. 17; xi. 3-5). The conquest of Hesbon and Bashan is NOT mentioned. Evidently these chapters suppose the Israelites still to be in the deserts of the Sinaitic

peninsula. The first attack on the inhabitants from Kades was not yet made. According to i. 2, they sojourn in the desert eleven days' journeys on the way from Horeb to Mount Seir by Kadeshbarnea. At that place they received full instructions from Moses for the present and the future. Until then everybody did what was right in his own eyes (xii. 8).

Chapters viii., ix., and x. 12-22 are additions, which made these historical remembrances better agree with the situation of the people in the land of Moab. They refer to the forthcoming crossing of Jordan, the events at Kades, and the wandering in the desert, which is explained as a trial and not as a punishment (viii. 5).

The book pretended to give in its two parts (1-4 and 5-26) a complete record of the laws given by Moses. In the land of Moab he repeated to them what they knew already; he wrote it carefully down (i. 5), and made them solemnly enter into a second covenant with the Lord (xxviii. 69).

Its aim was to give a revision of current historical tradition and to reform those religious customs which did not agree to the theological standpoint of its authors.

They lived in Jerusalem in the seventh century. The sorrowful condition of the national religion compelled them to make an earnest endeavour for reformation of the nearly extinguished cult of Jahu in the Temple.

In their days very little was left of the old glory of the house of David. The sphere of influence of the king of Juda was practically confined to Jerusalem and its environment. In 701 the Assyrians devastated not less than 46 fortified cities. Numerous places that were not fortified were also destroyed. The population was deported. 200,150 people, young and old, male and female, had to go in exile. The greater part of Juda was given to the kings of Asdod, Ekron and Gaza. The king of Jerusalem had to pay a heavy tribute and had to send his daughters, with an escort of palace-officials, to Ninive, in order to offer it to the king of Assyria.

The result of this destruction of former glory was twofold. At one hand it led to a revival of Jahwistic orthodoxy,

but not of official Jahwism. The firstborn children were sacrificed in Tophet in honour of Jahu, according to the old commandment of the book of the covenant (Ex. xxii. 29, *cf.* Ezech. xx. 25). In the temple these sacrifices were refused. At the other hand official Jahwism was mixed up with foreign cults, especially with the worship of the sun, the moon, and the stars.

In these circumstances the only way of saving the cult of the national god was to free religious worship and religious customs from all that was inconsistent with the worship of him alone. The only possible answer to the polytheistic rites of this period was monotheism.

This led, in the first place, to an earnest appeal to do away with all foreign cults. But it implied also that only one type of worship could exist. Jahu, as worshipped in Tophet, could not be regarded as another form of the Lord that was worshipped on Mount Sion (xi. 17). The Lord is one (vi. 4).

Sufficient control was only possible if the worship was confined to one place. If Deuteronomy was a legislation for the whole country from Dan (or even from Euphrates, *cf.* i. 7 ; xi. 24) to Berseba, the concentration of worship in one place might seem impossible, but the political situation of Juda in the seventh century makes it perfectly clear. Scholars have lately tried to prove that the text of Deuteronomy would admit various sacred places in different tribes, but xii. 14 does not admit this assumption, as Budde has shown.

The worship of the national god was in many instances connected with rites and customs that found their origin in cults or ideas inconsistent with the monotheistic tendency of Deuteronomy. If the original meaning of these customs was forgotten, the authors found no reason for objection. A great many customs connected with old animistic ideas are accepted by them in the current form. Ceremonies that gave offence to monotheism were altered. The slave, who declined to be set free after six years' service, is brought to the doorpost (xv. 16). The Elohim of Ex. xxi. 6 are omitted.

The doorpost was the usual place for the images or

symbols of the house-gods. Their symbols are altered into a copy of a holy text.

The custom of having a holy symbol tattooed between the eyes and on the arms is transformed into the command to bind copies of a holy text between the eyes and on the arms.

The feast of the night of the first full-moon after the spring-equinox, in which everybody had to keep awake and nobody was allowed to leave the house, became a feast in the temple, and was combined with the days of unleavened bread.

The old doctrine concerning Jahu was that he was visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation (Ex. xxxiv. 7, Num. xiv. 18, Jer. xxxii. 18). This doctrine left in those days of foreign religious influence very little hope for the future of Israel. The conception of Deuteronomy breaks with this doctrine and assumes the theory of personal responsibility. The children are not to be punished for the iniquity of the fathers (vii. 11; xxiv. 16). The text of the ten commandments, therefore, is revised, and the words "to my haters" and "to my friends" are inserted.

These instances of alteration of existing customs and conviction seem sufficient proof for the thesis that Deuteronomy intends to reform the cult of the national god. This implied that historical tradition was to be revised also. The laws of Exodus 21-23 were given on Mount Sinai, and, according to the original form of tradition, engraved on the two tablets of stone that Moses received from the Lord. Deuteronomy assumes that the ten commandments were written on those tablets, and commands that the Deuteronomic laws are to be engraved on great stones, that are to be set up immediately after the passage of Jordan.

There is only one period in the history of Israel in which this attempt of reformation can be placed—viz., the seventh century. For only in this period was the sacrifice of the first-born and the cult of the sun, the moon, and the stars a prominent feature.

The old theory that the reformation of Josiah was based

on D stands unshaken. It cannot be denied that Josiah destroyed places of worship in Jerusalem itself and in the neighbourhood, that Pesah was celebrated in a new way, that he put away the wizards, the terafim, etc. The only place in the Thora in which various kind of wizards are mentioned and forbidden is Deut. xviii. 11-13.

The narrative about the finding of the book does not admit to give it an older date than the seventh century. In 2 Kings xxii. 4-8 the book is found at the opening of the chest, in which was put the money that was brought into the house of the Lord (2 Kings xii. 10). The text of Kings leaves it open to suspect that it was found in another place, as Hilkiah says, " I have found the book of the law in the house of the Lord," but 2 Chrn. xxxiv. 14 shows that it was found in the chest. " And when they brought the money that was brought into the house of the Lord Hilkiah the priest found the book of the law." So there is no room for the theory of finding a book that was hidden in the wall. There is also no room for the theory that it was older and dates back to Solomon, for we know that the chest the book was found in was not made before king Joas (2 Kings xii. 10).

Probably only the first part was read to the king, immediately after it was found.

The great number of additions shows that it was well studied by succeeding generations of priests. We see its influence also in the text of Exodus (Exod. xiii. 14). Up to the present day the Mezuza and the tefillin prove that the authors of Deuteronomy did not work in vain.

B. D. EERDMANS.

THE SMALLEST LITERARY UNIT IN THE NARRATIVE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The problem of the smallest literary unit in the individual books and groups of books in the Old Testament, is one which has been frequently treated in recent years. This is as it should be, for the isolation of the smallest literary units is a necessary condition, both for correct exegesis and for a satisfactory history of Israelite literature. In the Psalter and in the Proverb-books, of course, the matter is quite simple : the smallest literary unit is the individual Psalm and the individual proverb, or at any rate such an independent group of proverbs as is easily recognisable. The smallest literary units in the prophetic books are much harder to determine, and different students vary widely one from another in their delimitation, and, therefore to some extent, in their explanation of the present text. Still more confused are views on the smallest literary units in the narrative books, and here we must, unfortunately, admit that recent years have witnessed, not only progress, but also the reverse.

If our question is concerned with the smallest literary unit in the narrative, it is obvious that we are thinking only of the narratives proper, not of the poems, riddles, proverbs, etc., scattered through the narrative books (we limit ourselves to the Hexateuch, Judges, and Samuel). With these it is normally obvious that they are independent literary units.

The question of the smallest *literary* unit is not the same as that of the smallest unit of *subject;* on the contrary, the two questions must be kept absolutely apart. It is

clear that in subject the creation-narrative of P has nothing to do with his flood story, but it is equally certain that the two narratives are originally conceived with reference to one another, inasmuch as the second presupposes the first, and the first finds its completion in the second. This often happens. When we look at the subject, individual narratives, which appear as records of separate historical events or as presentations of definite folk-tales and sagas, are independent, but when we look at their literary form, they are seen to be parts of a larger whole. The indication of an independent subject is by no means to be taken as evidence to show that these individual subjects ever had a separate and isolated literary form. Still less does it prove—even if it be true—that this primitive form is preserved in what lies before us, or that it can be recovered by eliminating the words and sentences which link it to the larger context. Rather may the narratives—once independent—in which the author speaks to us, be treated as his raw material.

The limits of an independent narrative-unit, then, are to be set on the horizon of the narrative in question. If this reaches out beyond a particular "single narrative," and if those elements which point forwards and backwards are integral parts of it, it cannot form an independent literary unit, but must be a portion of a greater one. But if the horizon of a single narrative coincides with its beginning and its end, then it is an independent literary unit. The question is, then, to what class do the narratives of our narrative-books belong? Are they, on the one hand, self-contained, independent narratives, so that we must regard our books, or rather the sources that lie below them, as loosely connected collections of a number of single narratives, having no literary significance? Or, on the other hand, are they part of larger contexts which include a number of single narratives, and deserve close attention both for their own sake and for the complete understanding of the single narratives.

A decision can only be reached by *study of the individual cases*. This necessarily means that we must limit ourselves to a small selection. It has already been pointed out that the creation story of P is related to his flood story, and

that the latter is the inevitable continuation of the former. I. 31, "And God saw all that He had made, and behold! it was very good," and vi. 12, "And God saw the earth, and behold! it was corrupt," are phrases which are obviously used with reference to one another. The same remark may be made of the dietary regulations laid down in i. 29-30 and in ix. 3. When the narrator records the purely vegetarian diet for man (i. 29-30) he has in view the divine permission, given later, to eat meat (ix. 3), and when he communicates this more extended rule, he refers expressly back to the earlier regulation. These and other features, which reach out beyond the individual narrative, make it clear that P's creation and flood narratives are not to be regarded as two independent literary units, but as parts of a larger context. The same thing is true of the other narratives of P. His narratives of the residence of the Israelites in Egypt and of the Egyptian plagues (Ex. i.-xi.) form a tolerably compact larger context, but they are connected on the one hand with the patriarchal histories (compare i. 1-5, vi. 2-4), and on the other hand point to a connection with their sequel (xii. 1-14). The narrative of the announcement of Moses' death and of the appointment of Joshua as his successor (Num. xxvii. 12-23), with its references to the death of Aaron (v. 13) and the miracle of the well (v. 14), presupposes what has gone before, and with its main theme, the installation of Joshua, prepares the way for what follows. In all these cases the connecting links are integral parts of the narratives, not merely secondary additions.

The same thing is true of the *Elohist* (E). The story of the risks Sarah ran with king Abimelech at Gerar (Gen. xx. 1-18) is a comparatively independent narrative, but its significance is due to the fact that it is an element in a larger context. The woman who is to be the mother of the heir of promise is surrendered, and so the promise itself is jeopardised. But God finds a way of escape. The reference back to Abraham's departure from his home (v. 13) serves to form a connection with the foregoing narrative, and Abimelech's request that Abraham should remain in his land is written with a view to the following

negotiations over Beersheba. It is equally true that the narrative of the offering up of Isaac is originally planned as a part of a larger context, and is only intelligible in this light. The aged father's only son is near death, and with him the promise of which he is the medium threatens also to perish, but again God intervenes to establish His promise. The story of the way in which Jacob filched away the blessing of the first-born (Gen. xxvii.) is connected with Rebecca's demand that Jacob should flee to her brother Laban in Haran (v. 43), the E-narrative of Gen. xxiv., and prepared the way, not only for Jacob's residence with Laban and his journey thither (Gen. xxviii. 31), but also for his succeeding dealings with Esau (Gen. xxxii., xxxiii.). The narrative of the birth of Jacob's children in Gen. xxix., xxx., xxxv. 16-20, according to which Joseph and Benjamin are the only sons of Rachel, prepares the way for the Joseph narrative, which presupposes a knowledge of Rachel as the favourite wife of Jacob, of her two sons, Joseph and Benjamin, and of their relative ages.

In the Yahwist (J), who, generally speaking, runs parallel to E, matters are as with E. In that element in J which runs parallel to E there still remain some unharmonious sections which are widely recognised as belonging to another stratum, and which I have claimed as parts of another chain of narratives, the Lay-source (L). It is unquestionably here that the comparative independence of the individual narratives is greatest. But even here they are not absolutely independent, but were rather originally planned to be, in the form in which they lie before us, to be parts of a larger context. Thus the narrative of the visit of the three men to Abraham and of the destruction of Sodom (Gen. xviii.-xix.) presupposes the emigration of Abraham and Lot from their home (xii. 4 ; xi. 31) and their parting (xiii. 2-13), and prepares the way for an account of the birth of Isaac. So, while in its subject-matter the story of the destruction of Sodom is entirely independent, and has originally nothing to do with its context, since it is not of Israelite provenance, nevertheless, in the form in which it lies before us, it is certainly part of a larger whole, not an independent literary unit. The

same remark may be made of Jacob's struggle with a demon (Gen. xxxii. 25-33). There is no doubt that underlying this we have a local tradition of a stream-demon, who tries to prevent people from crossing the stream, and to kill those who attempt it. But the reference of this tradition to Jacob can have taken place only when it is introduced into the larger context, and is only fully to be understood in connection with it. On the very threshold of the land promised to him as an inheritance, Jacob has to overcome a frightful danger, in addition to all the tests which have previously been applied to him, and this threat to his inheritance becomes his most certain guarantee of its attainment. For that is the meaning of the change of name from Jacob to Israel, involved in the demon's blessing. It is further (as I tried to show in 1923 in the Gunkel Festschrift) only as parts of a larger context that we can understand the quite isolated narratives of Reuben's misbehaviour with Bilhah (Gen. xxxv. 21, 22), of the crime against Shechem committed by Simeon and Levi (Gen. xxxiv.), of Judah and Tamar (Gen. xxxviii.), of the curses on Reuben, Simeon, and Levi which depend on these narratives, and of the blessing on Judah which, according to Dt. xxxiii. 7, is to be substituted for the present utterance over Judah in Gen. xlix. 8-12.

What is true of the Pentateuch is true also of the *earlier historical books*. Here, too, the "individual narratives" are generally to be regarded, not as independent literary units, but as parts of a larger context. This has been generally admitted in the case of sections like II. Sam. 9-20, I. Ki. 1-2. It is, further, practically agreed, at least by older commentators, that the narratives of Samuel's victory over the Philistines (I. Sam. 7), of the desire of the people for a king (8), of the election of Saul (x. 17-20), of Samuel's farewell address (12), and of Saul's victory over the Amalekites and his rejection (15), form a self-contained context. From this it follows that chs. xii. and xv. become intelligible only when they are removed from their present environment and placed in their original context—that is, if when Samuel's farewell address (ch. xii.) follows immediately on Saul's election (ch. x.), and Saul's com-

mission to make war on the Amalekites again follows immediately on Samuel's farewell address (ch. xii.). But there is also in the books of Samuel a series of collections which have not hitherto been recognised. Thus a thread is traceable from I. Sam. xvii., in which David stands in a peculiarly close relation to Jonathan ; he is his squire, not Saul's, and is especially recommended to him. At the end of the Goliath narrative in xviii. 1-4 it is Jonathan, not Saul, who keeps David with him, and it is only the erroneous explanation " Saul " in v. 2 which has prevented this from being realised long ago. If that be removed, it is at once recognised that the sentence, " and Jonathan loved him as his own soul, and took him that day, and would let him go no more home to his father's house," is parallel to the expression in xvi. 21-22, " And David came to Saul, and he loved him greatly . . . and Saul sent to Jesse saying, etc." That David is in the service of Jonathan, not of Saul, is also assumed in the narrative of Jonathan's approval of David's flight (I. Sam. xx., compare vv. 8, 13, 17, 30), which is thereby characteristically distinguished from the parallel narrative in xix. 1-7. Sections like xxii. 8 ; II. Sam. i. 1-4, 11, 12, 12-27 ; iv. 4 ; xxx. 9 ; xxi. 7 seem to reflect the narrative of this quite peculiar relation of friendship and service between David and Jonathan ; so that references back to it are always (even II. Sam. xxi. 7) constituent elements in their context, or must be treated (so II. iv. 4) as the remains of a more complete narrative.

Again, the context (I. Sam. vii. 8 ; x. 17-20 ; xii. 15) may not only be followed backwards into the story of Samuel's childhood (i.-iii.), but also forwards. It is continued in the narratives of David's annointing by Samuel, of David's flight to Samuel (xix. 18-24 ; xx. 1*a*), of Samuel's death and burial, and David's flight into the wilderness of Paran (xxv. 1), and the enquiry of the witch (and so of Samuel) by Saul (xxviii. 3-25). In the last two sections it may be especially clearly shown that they become fully intelligible only when they are removed from their present context and restored to their original position. In the main thread of this narrative David has not left Judah, except for short

excursions into Gath (xxi. 11-16) and to Moab (xxii. 3-5), but after the death of his protector Samuel, betakes himself to the desert of Paran, because in Judah he would be now more exposed than ever to Saul's ambushes. There is, then, no reason to change "Paran" into "Maon," since it is dictated merely by incorrect reference to its present environment, but in relation to the older context, appears unnecessary, indeed meaningless. Still more clearly does the narrative of xxviii. 3-25 find its full meaning only in its original connection. The introductory, v. 3, from which nothing need be excised, states that after the death of Samuel, Saul has exterminated witches from the land, so that the spirit of his dead enemy may not be set in motion against him by David or his partisans. The tragedy in Saul's story is that in his supreme need he himself is compelled to have recourse to Samuel's spirit. Even v. 12—so much discussed and misinterpreted—is intelligible without any alteration in the light of the larger context: "When the woman saw that it was Samuel (whom the enquirer wished brought up), she cried with a loud voice." For now she knows whom she has before her. At bottom there are only two persons who are interested in Samuel, David, his protegé, and Saul, his enemy. Since the general situation puts David out of the question, the enquirer can be none other than Saul. It may be said, then, of the great majority of the narratives in the narrative books of the Old Testament, that, in the form in which we now have them, they were originally planned as parts of larger contexts from which alone they are fully to be understood.

Entirely independent individual narratives, on the other hand, are comparatively rare. Possibly we have such a self-contained individual narrative in the story of Cain and Abel, a story which aims only at explaining to the narrator and to his circle the nomadic life of the tribe of Cain, which appears so frightful; then an explanation of the word "Cain" is inserted into a context already present and linked up with it through the concluding "east of Eden." Individual narratives of another kind are "Hadith"—phenomena like Num. xxxi., the "narrative" of the expedition to take vengeance on Midian; here we have an accretion to an

existing context. A similar judgment must be passed on the account of the execution of the five kings of southern Canaan near the cave of Makkedah (Josh. x. 16-27), and here we must observe that the motive for the accretion obviously lies in some local tradition. On the other hand, there are not wanting in the narrative books *secondary links* between the individual narratives. In Gen. ix. 22, for instance, the words, " Ham, the father of (Canaan)," certainly do not form an integral part of the narrative of the cursing of Canaan, but are attached to it in order to connect it with its context. The same thing is true of Gen. xxvi. 15, 18, which connect the second Beersheba story (xxvi. 12-33) with the first (xxi. 22-34), and of Dt. xxvii. 1-8 and Jos. viii. 30-35, which connect the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx. 22-23 ; xix.) with the narrative of the Hexateuch. Still, compared with the connecting passages embedded in the narratives, such secondary links are rare.

Since this is so, it is clear that it is not the " individual narrative " which is to be regarded as the smallest independent literary unit in the narrative books, but the larger context, whose extent must be determined by study of the horizon of the individual narratives. In seeking for modern analogies to the Old Testament, we must avoid the common practice of drawing parallels from collections of disconnected folk-tales and sagas like Grimm's, or from a group of stories loosely enclosed in a framework of narrative, like the Thousand and One Nights ; we must rather refer for our illustration to the connected history of a nation, or to historical novels. The comparison between the Old Testament narrative threads and such modern literary instances may be unsatisfactory, in that the " individual narratives " of the former have a far greater relative independence than those of the latter, but, nevertheless, the other parallel is far less suitable.

The situation, then, of the scientific study of the narrative books of the Old Testament seems to me to be this. During the last thirty years, criticism has been concerned essentially with the subject matter, and, thus conditioned, the treatment of the individual narratives as independent literary

units, and the resultant view of the larger structures as mere collections of disconnected stories, have promoted to an extraordinary degree the understanding of the individual narratives and of their subject matter. At the same time, it often loses that appreciation of the larger contexts which was developed by earlier scholars, and it has, in any case, retarded the further progress of the study in this direction. It is time—high time—that a change should be made. With the observation and increase of the valuable knowledge that has already been gained from a study of the individual narratives, we may once more give our attention to the larger contexts, and supplement the knowledge of an earlier day with our fresh views. Great is the task that lies before us, and far shall we be carried by those new areas of knowledge which beckon us as our reward.

OTTO EISSFELDT.

SOME REMARKS ON THE *HISTORICAL GRAMMAR OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE* BY BAUER AND LEANDER (HALLE), 1922.

The first volume of the "Historical Grammar of the Hebrew Language," by Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, is probably by this time familiar to most Hebraists in this country, as it was published five years ago. The second volume, so far as I have been able to ascertain, has not yet appeared, and it is, therefore, impossible at present to criticise the work as a whole. Since, however, the authors claim to have arrived at certain new and startling results, I think it may be of interest to examine some of the theories which they ask us to accept. These theories, I need hardly say, have already been discussed by others, in particular by G. Bergsträsser in the *Orientalischer Litteraturzeitung* for 1923, columns 253-260 and 477-481, to whom Prof. Hans Bauer replied in a pamphlet entitled "*Zur Frage der der Sprachmischung im Hebräischen*," published in 1924. In treating of the grammar we must, at the same time, take account of the pamphlet.

In the preface to the grammar the authors profess to have devoted special attention to comparative philology, and to explain the language of the Old Testament by means of the kindred tongues with a precision which has not hitherto been attempted. With regard to the relation in which Hebrew stands to the other Semitic languages, their theory may be briefly described as follows :—

The Semitic languages, we are told, form two main groups, the Old group and the Younger group. The Old group consists of Hebrew and Assyrio-Babylonian or, as the authors prefer to call it, Akkadian. The Younger group

includes Phoenician, Aramaic, Arabic, and the Semitic languages of Abyssinia. Thus Phoenician, which has hitherto been regarded as closely akin to Hebrew, is separated from it, while Assyro-Babylonian, which in many respects differs from all other Semitic languages, is said to be nearly related to Hebrew. But what are we to understand by Hebrew? Not the language spoken by the Israelites before they invaded Palestine, for the original language of the Israelites, according to Bauer and Leander, belonged to the Younger group—that is to say, it was akin to Aramaic and Arabic. Hebrew was the language of the ancient inhabitants of Palestine, but in process of time this primitive Hebrew language came to be modified through intercourse with tribes who spoke languages belonging to the Younger group, such as the Amorites and the Ḥabīrī, who figure so largely in the Tell-el-Amarna documents. When the Israelites settled in Palestine they adopted the Hebrew language in its modified form, so that the language of the Old Testament is a mixed dialect, based upon the original Hebrew, but containing a certain number of words and grammatical forms which are borrowed from the Younger dialects.

The evidence for this theory is derived partly from certain peculiarities of Hebrew vocalisation, partly from certain features of Hebrew Syntax, in particular the use of the tenses, and partly from a study of the Hebrew vocabulary.

With regard to the vocalisation, great stress is laid upon the fact that Biblical Hebrew sometimes exhibits the vowel ā when we should expect an ō. But it seems to me that Bauer and Leander have failed to realise that our knowledge of the vocalisation of the Semitic languages three thousand years ago is necessarily very imperfect. Whether, for example, the ancient Israelites pronounced the word ḳām with a long ā, a short ă, or some other vowel, it is impossible to say. And if the ancient pronunciation of Hebrew is uncertain, the same thing applies even more to Phoenician and Moabite. As for the pronunciation of the Amorites and the Ḥabīrī, I must leave it to be discussed by those whose knowledge of the past is derived, not from documents, but from intuition.

As regards the use of the verbal tenses, Bauer and Leander hold that the Perfect (or, as they call it, the *Nominal*) originally referred to the present, whereas the Imperfect (or, as they call it, the *Aorist*) referred to the past.[1] This primitive usage is, to a considerable extent, preserved in Assyrio-Babylonian and Hebrew, while in all the other Semitic languages the tenses have, in some mysterious way, exchanged their functions, the Perfect being applied to the past and the Imperfect to the present or future. In Assyrio-Babylonian the tense which is said to correspond to the Hebrew Perfect is called by some Assyriologists the Present (Brockelmann, i. p. 569) and by others the 1st Imperfect. It differs in form from the Hebrew Perfect by having a pronominal prefix instead of a pronominal affix. The Assyrio-Babylonian tense which corresponds to the Hebrew Imperfect is the Preterite or 2nd Imperfect. Hence the Hebrew use of the Imperfect with the so-called Wāw conversive to denote past action is an instance of the primitive meaning which belongs to that tense in Assyrio-Babylonian. But Bauer and Leander appear to have overlooked the fact that the use of the Imperfect in speaking of the past is not by any means confined to Hebrew and Assyrio-Babylonian. Several instances of the Imperfect with the Wāw conversive occur in the Aramaic inscription of a king of Hamath, who lived in the eighth century before Christ, an inscription published and translated twenty years ago by Pagnon, who discovered it. Moreover, in classical Arabic, as Nöldeke long ago pointed out,[2] we find examples of the Imperfect with *wa* or *fa*, which exactly correspond to the Hebrew usage. How widely this usage prevailed in ancient times it is impossible to say, but the fact that hitherto it has been found in one Aramaic inscription and not in any other Aramaic text proves that no argument can be based on its absence. Thus, for example, we have no right to assert that it was unknown in Phoenician, although there may be no examples of it in Phoenician inscriptions, for we must

[1] P. 6, Syntaktisch in der Erhaltung der ursprünglichen Funktion der beiden Tempusformen (*iaqtul* in perfektischer, *qatala* in präsentischer Bedeutung).
[2] *Zur Gramm. des class. Arab.*, p. 68.

remember that Phoenician inscriptions consist almost entirely of certain fixed formulæ. Narrations such as we find in the Old Testament are wholly absent, and it is chiefly in narratives that the use of tenses is exhibited. Nor is it legitimate to assume, with Bauer and Leander, that, with regard to the use of the tenses, Assyrio-Babylonian is more primitive than the other Semitic languages. It is generally admitted that at a very early period, long before the date of the oldest Assyrio-Babylonian inscriptions, the language was profoundly influenced by contact with non-Semitic peoples, in particular the Sumerians. What happens to a Semitic language under such conditions we may judge by two notable instances in comparatively recent times, Neo-Syriac in Kurdistan and Amharic in Abyssinia. In both of these cases we see a Semitic language in which the ancient system of verbal inflection has been almost entirely transformed through contact with foreigners. I, therefore, venture to maintain that the use of the verbal tenses in Hebrew (a term which, of course, includes the language of the Moabite Stone) is merely a development of tendencies which existed also in ancient Aramaic and Arabic.

I now come to the third kind of evidence, that which is supplied by the Hebrew vocabulary as compared with the vocabulary of the other Semitic languages. In order to show the close connection between Hebrew and Assyrio-Babylonian, Bauer and Leander give a list of words which are common to these two languages, but have no equivalent in the so-called Younger group (p. 7). The first word in the list is *'eleph*, "ox," which corresponds to the Assyrio-Babylonian *alpu*. But Bauer and Leander seem to have forgotten that this word, which is rare in Biblical Hebrew, was the ordinary word for "ox" in Phoenician, as appears from its occurrence in the well-known sacrificial inscription of Marseilles, where the various animals used for sacrifice are enumerated. I do not wish to lay stress upon the fact that this word occurs also in the inscription of King Kalimu (or Kalumu), since it might be urged that the language of the inscription in question is a mixture of Phoenician and Assyrio-Babylonian. The inscription of Marseilles,

on the other hand, is universally recognised as Phoenician, and is generally supposed to have been brought to Marseilles from Carthage.

That the Hebrew vocabulary contains a certain number of words which are found nowhere else except in Assyrio-Babylonian, no one would, of course, deny. But exactly the same thing may be said of Hebrew as compared with Aramaic, Arabic or Aethiopic. It would be absurd, for instance, to conclude that there is some special connection between Hebrew and Aethiopic, because those two languages have certain words in common which are either unknown or very rare in the other Semitic dialects. In dealing with this subject, it is important to remember that Biblical Hebrew and Assyrio-Babylonian are the only Semitic languages of which we possess any considerable amount of literature dating from pre-Christian times. If we had anything like the same amount of literature of the same date in Aramaic or Arabic we should probably find that the resemblances between Hebrew and Assyrio-Babylonian, to which Bauer and Leander attach so much importance, were far outweighed by resemblances between the vocabulary of the Hebrews and that of the Aramaeans and Arabs.

For these reasons I cannot but think that the whole theory of the Old group and of the Younger group of the Semitic languages rests on a very insecure foundation.

A. A. BEVAN.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

In the time at my disposal it will not be possible to do more than draw attention to one or two points which I hope to elaborate, with illustrations, in a forthcoming publication on the subject of this address.

The progress of archæological research in Palestine is of special interest to us for many reasons. To two in particular I invite your attention: (i) not only is it adding to our knowledge of the Bible, but it *seems* to be supporting conservative rather than radical views of Biblical history and religion. Indeed, a contrast is still often drawn between *Archæology* and *Criticism*, as though the latter were purely subjective and the former purely objective. But this is a false contrast, and the reason why archæology is so important is that it provides an independent line of approach to the Biblical problems. To this all scholars would agree. If, then, scholars differ, as they frequently do differ, regarding the verdict of archæology and the monuments, we have to realise that the interpretation of archæological evidence is not so simple as is often supposed.

Now, there are two points in particular which I wish to emphasise in this paper: one concerns the interpretation of archæological data; the other the continuity in the history of Palestine. It is a well-known fact that Palestine cannot be severed archæologically from the neighbouring lands. Throughout Egypt and South-west Asia there was a certain similarity of life and thought, of material and spiritual culture; yet, at the same time, no one can doubt that Palestine was not only relatively poor, it had also peculiarities of its own. In addition to this, throughout its lengthy

history there was a certain cultural unity and continuity, although at the same time we can see that each period, closely connected though it was with its predecessor and successor, had its own characteristics. Geographically Palestine is one with its environment, but it preserves its individuality; historically each great period is continuous with what precedes and with what follows, but it has its own specific stamp.

As regards the interpretation of archæological data, it is obviously necessary, when we consider seals or coins or decorated stones, to ask what meaning the symbols or devices had for the people of old. Can we recover the meaning, and determine the light these throw upon ancient thought? In answer to this we have to observe, first, that *Palestinian* archæology has often *directly* illustrated ancient *Palestinian* life. It is enough to refer to false weights, foundation sacrifices, and cults of Astarte or the Mother goddess. Second, *Palestinian or Biblical* life and thought have often been illustrated by the archæology, not of Palestine, but of the surrounding lands. For example, there are the overshadowing wings of the god, the god's helping hand, the introduction of the worshipper into the presence of the god, the enemy as one's footstool, and much else which obviously was full of meaning to the Hebrew or Israelite, but these do not happen to be found in Palestine.

But, third, we have the far more difficult cases where archæology supplements, or seems to supplement, the Bible. Now here we are under no obligation whatever to presume that *every* Egyptian or Mesopotamian scene or symbol must have conveyed a meaning to the Hebrew; but we do often find in Palestine itself symbols which seem to us more foreign than native. For example, we have in Palestine representations of the Egyptian *ankh*, the sign of life, ☥—may we assume that Hebrews or Israelites were familiar with its meaning and with all that it conveyed to the ordinary Egyptian? There is archæological evidence from Palestine pointing to some sort of a belief in a future life; what meaning did *that* have?

It is here that caution is necessary. May we suppose—*e.g.*, that the Egyptians of whom we find so many traces

in Palestine, familiarised people with the characteristic Egyptian beliefs in the next world and in the judgment scene and so forth? In the Egyptian romance of Sinuhe, perhaps of the twenty-second century B.C., the hero tells how, when he was living in Palestine, he sang the praises of his king, the divine Pharaoh, "the god who has none like him, before whom no other existed." Did this idea of a divine king mean anything to the Palestinians? If we turn to the Amarna letters of a few centuries later, we can see how the native princes recognise the reigning Pharaoh, their suzerain, as their god. The divine kingship *was* a familiar idea; and although it is true that the O.T. seems to deprecate this institution, against this fact must be set the influence which it has had upon Messianic ideas and the miscellaneous evidence for the god-king Molek or Melek.

Caution, I repeat, is always necessary, but when we combine the evidence of archæology and the monuments, we gain some very vivid glimpses of religious belief and custom, of which the O.T. preserves only fragments, hints, and aspects.

We find representations of Egyptian deities in Palestine, and of Palestinian or Syrian deities in Egypt. We know what "the Baal" meant for Egypt in the nineteenth Dynasty, but what the Egyptian gods meant for Palestine, we can hardly guess. Yet there was a tendency to identify similar gods—the various sun-gods (Re, Shamash), or gods of rain and storm (Addu, Hadad, Ramman). Yahweh himself resembles in certain respects a sun-god, and also a god of rain and storm; and not only was he confused with Baal, but he must have been connected with the old sun-god Shamash and with the rain-god Hadad. These are the two great, prominent, gods of the Amarna age, say 1400 B.C., and one of the most important problems is that of the way in which these were replaced by the national Hebrew or Israelite god Yahweh. This problem has not been solved. The Biblical student is, and must be always, keenly interested in the religion of Moses and of the Israelites in the wilderness, but it is not less important to consider what Palestine had to offer the Israelites who entered the

land, and upon this the archæology and the monuments furnish objective evidence.

It is now generally agreed that when we speak of the worship of Yahweh, we are not necessarily to think of the fine spiritual ideas held by the great spiritual prophets and reformers—*they* represent the high-water mark of Hebrew religion. Now in Elephantine in Upper Egypt, in the fifth century B.C., Yahweh, or rather Yahu, is associated with two deities, who are probably female. This is not in the least surprising. We must remember that the Jews lived among the Egyptians, and that at Elephantine the local god KHNUM was associated with the goddesses Aunki and Sati, and that a late Greek inscription identifies this Egyptian triad with Ammon-Zeus, Hera and Hestia. "Your Yahu, our Khnum," said the polite Egyptians, even as in India it is "your Christ, our Krishna." And if the Egyptian pointed to the mother-goddess Anuki and to Sati, how did the Jew respond, if not by pointing to the associates of Yahu—namely, Anath-Bethel and Ishm-Bethel? Moreover, just as Yahu was naturally equated with Khnum of Elephantine—and, no doubt, with other local Egyptian gods elsewhere—so on a south Palestinian coin, of about the same age or a little later, a Greek god, apparently a solar Zeus, is explicitly styled Yahu in Aramaic lettering.

At Tahpanhes or Daphne, in the Delta, where Jewish and other troops were quartered, was found a rather earlier stela with some god, not Egyptian, but probably Asiatic. The Egyptologist, Max Müller, threw out the conjecture that it was Yahweh—this we can neither prove nor disprove. But in certain respects the symbolism suggests Marduk, and we have to observe that Yahweh, who could be identified with Hadad, or Baal, or Khnum, or Zeus, would, in the Persian age, be equated with the pure ethical Ahura-Mazda, and earlier with Asshur or Marduk.

This being so, we are not to be surprised if the Hebrew or Israelite Yahweh in the O.T. sometimes has foreign or exotic elements associating him with other gods, or if some of the Palestinian seals, representing deities, are really depicting the god of Israel. Most remarkable of such seals

is one from Jerusalem inscribed "Elisha, son of Gedaliah," representing a boat with bird-like prow and stern, and conveying a seated figure. Now, such boats are found on Mesopotamian seals, and appear to represent the journey of the gods. But, you will say, Yahweh made the clouds his chariot, and in the Temple of Jerusalem were the horses of the sun. Indeed, in the Roman period, to judge from coins and other evidence, deities were still carried about on cars, and one Syrian monument even shows us the Sun on horseback. Nevertheless, the boat persists, and to the present day the Sheikh's daughter, the inspirer of the warriors and the palladium of the tribe, will ride in a *merkab* or *dollah* which, we are told, "looks somewhat like a boat placed on a camel." Does this Israelite seal represent the god of Israel in a boat? We can only say that this conjecture is not to be ignored as impossible.

As I have referred to coins of the Roman period, I have now to remark that these frequently illustrate the persistence of very archaic elements. On an old Sidonian type there is a sacred stone or betyl on a car with three shafts; it was evidently drawn by four animals, just as at Philadelphia, beyond the Jordan, Heracles was conveyed in a four-horsed chariot. Coins from Ptolemais—Acre of the third cent. A.D.—represent a shrine with a Zeus, and we can even see the projecting poles by which it was carried. It is interesting to recall that in the Temple of Solomon the staves of the Ark were just visible, and, adds the writer, "there they are unto this day" (I. Ki. viii. 8). A coin from Byblos gives a good illustration of altar-horns, and coins from Sidon of the first cent. A.D. represent a temple with two columns outside it, reminding us of Jachin and Boaz. Our parallels (Sidon, Paphos in Cyprus, and Hierapolis) are of the Greco-Roman period, clear proof of the persistence of old usages. The fish-deity is illustrated on coins that go back to the fourth cent. B.C.; and for the six-winged seraphim of Isaiah's vision we can turn to coins of Byblos of the first cent. B.C., where El or Kronos has three pairs of wings.

Perhaps the most interesting of all coins are those of the third cent. A.D. representing the two stones of Tyre, the

legendary rocks upon which the city was founded. They floated about in the sea with a sacred olive tree ; brought to rest they formed the foundations of the city. Dr. Hall, of the British Museum, recalls the old Phoenician myth that the cult-hero Usōos erected two stelae to fire and wind. The eminent Dominican, Father Lagrange, notes that Usōos venerated his two stelae and watered them with libations of the blood of beasts taken in hunting ; we have, he thinks, a confused recollection of the story of *the* deluge and of the sacrifice that followed it. On the coins the stones are called *ambrosian*, a hint that they were bedaubed with the food of the gods, honey, oil or fat—or was it blood ?

Now, if these two scholars are on the right track, I believe that the stelae may be connected with the Phoenician tradition of the *Ammouneis* or stones inscribed with mystic inscriptions from which Sanchuniathon obtained his wisdom. Moreover, in the Book of Jubilees, ch. vi., we read that after the Flood, heavenly tablets were inscribed with the chief annual festivals. Also, according to Josephus (i. 23), the Sethites, on learning that the world was to be destroyed by fire and also water, made two pillars on which they inscribed their astrological discoveries. The Carthaginian inscriptions with tariffs and lists of offerings are well known, and the Tyrian coins seem to point to a legend of stelae inscribed with ceremonial regulations and carefully preserved.

Again, we can also refer to the ark in the Temple at Jerusalem, with the tables of laws. The Judæan state was supposed to be founded—metaphorically—upon the *two* tables of the Law. Tyre was founded—more realistically—upon sacred stelae in some way connected with the Deluge and the institution of a new era. It is at least a coincidence that (after Herodotus) Tyre was supposed to be founded in the twenty-eighth cent. B.C., and that this falls between the traditional dates for the Deluge, according to the M.T., the twenty-sixth cent., according to the Samaritan text, the thirtieth cent.

Accordingly these late coins of Tyre are extremely interesting examples of the survival of beliefs which admit of being traced back for centuries, and they point to curious

myths and legends long after Israelite tradition had become canonical.

The coins, it may be objected, illustrate the more conventional ideas, and are not necessarily a key to current thought. Let us turn, then, to the Seleucidan site of Sandahannah, explorated by the Palestine Exploration Fund. Here were found examples of Greek art, among them a beautiful little statuette of a goddess. It is possible that she was the forerunner of the Christian Saint Anne, from whom the place derives its name. Here also were many examples of popular superstition; in particular, leaden figures with hands or legs bound together. They illustrate the sympathetic magic whereby men hoped to fetter and torment their foes. Similar to these is the small lead figure found at Samaria with its right arm and leg twisted off. All the evidence is of the Greek age, but it is not to be supposed that the beliefs involved were peculiar to that period. We have only to consider the demonology and magic, whether of ancient Babylonia and of the age of Rabbinic Judaism, or the recent view that the Psalms contain prayers for deliverance from magical practices. The psychological tendencies which foster magi and demonology are peculiar to no age or land; it is the particular form taken by the beliefs which distinguishes different periods and districts.

In like manner, astral ideas, though of course less universal, are in themselves pretty widely distributed. Here a reference may be made to a mosaic in a synagogue at Ain Duk near Jericho. It is marked with the four seasons and the twelve signs of the Zodiac, all with their Hebrew names. It is, perhaps, of the second cent. A.D. From Alexandrian coins and other evidence we know of the keen interest in astrology; but it is surely surprising to find a zodiac on the floor of a synagogue. In other synagogues, especially in Galilee, we find more or less strange, if not rather unorthodox, features—*e.g.*, animal figures, an eagle, etc. Accordingly, we have to distinguish between popular astrological superstitions, strict Rabbinical orthodoxy, and the rather compromising, mediating and syncretising tendencies such as may be looked for always and

everywhere. Now, near Ain Duk are Gilgal and the scene of the crossing of the Jordan ; at Ain Duk itself is a local legend of the fall of Jericho. And not only are traditions of the twelve tribes of Israel thus connected with the district, but, as we know from other sources, the twelve tribes and the twelve signs of the Zodiac were brought into connection one with another—*e.g.*, the crab was Reuben, the fishes Naphtali. Hence, although we have at Ain Duk a veritable Zodiac, there might have been a harmless and intelligible interpretation of it, associating it with national history and local tradition. Otherwise, it seems very difficult to account for its presence in a Jewish synagogue.

Lack of space forbids more than a passing reference to the Palestinian gods contemporary with the rise of Christianity ; this is a subject in itself. Mention can only be made of the prominence of Apollo and Apolline gods at Mareshah (Eleutheropolis) and elsewhere, and of the recurrence of Dionysus. Coins of Askalon represent " Phanebal " (" the face of Baal "), a youthful deity, though whether male or female is doubtful. At Gaza, coins depict Marna, evidently " our lord," again an Apollo type. Moreover, the great Baals of Syria were not necessarily even middle-aged, and it is important to remember that the heifer rather than the bull was the animal of the gods of rain and storm. The Aged Zeus, the Ancient of Days, the Elder Bel, and the Father-God represent only one aspect of the great gods, and the Yahweh who strode forth from the slaughter of Edom (Is. lxiii.) was surely a young warrior deity. This prominence of the *young* god, this recognition of a Face or Presence of Baal and of an " our lord," is very important for our conception of theistic ideas in the land where Christianity arose.

Christianity belongs to an age of Oriental reaction against a dying Hellenism. The coins, seals, and other evidence from Palestine, the prominence now of an Apollo-god and now of a Dionysus, and the curious pagan cult of Elagabalus of Homs or Emesa in Syria, combine to tell us of a riotous medley of religious belief and practice. And it goes without saying that there must have been many strange varieties of unorthodox and heterodox Judaism

and Christianity, and curious syncretisms, most of which have disappeared without leaving a trace.

Archæology permits us to go back before the Hyksos age and to descend to the Byzantine period. The modern popular religion throws much light upon ancient beliefs, and such a series as Beth-shan, Scythopolis, Beisan, is symptomatic of the continuity of the land. This continuity our conception of Biblical religion must certainly take into account. The student reads his Old Testament and passes to the New ; he leaves the Bible and follows the fortunes of the Christian Church, and, it may be, of Rabbinical Judaism. But the old sun and rain gods lived on—Hadad especially—and even the amazing emperor Elagabalus, the god in human form, appears to be only the "God-mountain," and El-Shaddai, if we may so explain this much disputed name.

We have to place the history of religion in the Bible upon the background of Palestinian religion. Israel has given us her own view of her history and of her religion. Can we find in the O.T. the religion of the Hyksos age or of the Amarna age ? Even the post-exilic Judaism of the Pentateuch represents only one aspect, though, to be sure, a very vital one, of Palestinian religion in the Persian age. Archæology and the monuments enable us to see something of what lies behind Judaism and early Christianity, and I cannot too forcibly emphasise the difference between the long and continuous history of Palestine, and the history of those religions which Jews and Christians have carried into the western world.

What was essential in those religions Palestine proved unable to assimilate. In the Bible we have not the actual *history* of those religions, and for myself I do not think we have sufficient material for reconstructing either the political history of the land or the history of its faiths. On the other hand, we do possess evidence for some tremendous creative periods in the past, and were it not for internal criticism and external evidence, we should not be able to realise the true significance of those periods.

The religion of Israel is not a chapter in a very lengthy continuous development. The O.T. does not give us the

religion, say from Abraham to Ezra ; but, with the N.T., the Bible reflects the result of vast creative movements ; and is of universal and permanent value so long as man continues to be interested in the greatest epoch-making events in the history of his race, and in factors in the progressive development of religion.

S. A. COOK.

LE DÉVELOPPEMENT DE LA DIASPORA JUIVE AU Ve SIÈCLE.

La plupart des historiens du judaïsme ne font commencer le rôle actif de la diaspora qu'à l'époque hellénistique. Dans une récente étude parue dans la Revue d'Histoire et de philosophie religieuse,[1] j'ai cru devoir insister sur le fait qu'il y avait dès avant l'exil une diaspora israélite et judaïte, et j'ai essayé de montrer que l'existence de cette diaspora plus ancienne permet seule d'expliquer la conservation de la tradition littéraire et le développement du judaïsme pendant l'exil. Il reste à prolonger les lignes de cette démonstration dans le champ de l'histoire subséquente et à examiner de ce point de vue les problèmes qui se posent à propos de la restauration juive du VIe et du Ve siècles. Je ne puis ici qu'indiquer rapidement quelques-uns de ces problèmes.

D'après la relation du Chroniste, relation dont il n'y a pas de raison suffisante de contester sur ce point l'exactitude, cette restauration fut l'oeuvre des *bene haggola* revenus de Babylone et directement appuyés par l'autorité perse.[2]

C'est à dire que, dès la première heure, la Jérusalem du second Temple apparaît comme une colonie de la diaspora orientale. C'est là un premier fait dont on ne saurait surestimer l'importance. Et voici un autre fait qu'il convient aussi de mettre en lumière : La restauration juive ne s'est pas faite du premier coup, une fois pour toutes ; la communauté hiérosolymite, colonie de la diaspora, n'a pu

[1] " Les Origines de la diaspora juive," *Revue d'hist. et de philosophie religieuse*, 1927, No. 2.

[2] Esdras i. et iv. à vi.

se maintenir pendant près d'un siècle que grâce à l'appui de cette diaspora : Appui matériel d'abord. Dans des circonstances difficiles et décevantes, les retournants ne peuvent mener à bonne fin la reconstruction du temple que grâce aux secours de leurs compatriotes demeurés dans la dispersion " aux dons d'or et d'argent, que tous ceux d'Israël de tous les lieus de leur séjour envoyaient pour la maison de Jahvé." [1] Et surtout l'appui spirituel, l'impulsion morale. Lorsque le judaïsme palestinien était menacé de décadence, pénétré de toutes parts par les influences payennes, ce sont les émigrants venus des juiveries rigoristes de Mesopotamie, Chaldée, qui, sous la direction de Néhémie et d'Esdras, réforment les mœurs et le culte, conformément aux exigences de la tora sacerdotale qu'ils avaient rapportée de Babylone, et épurent l'assemblée des enfants d'Israël.

Il ne me paraît pas que l'importance et la signification de cette action permanente de la diaspora, et cette dépendance de la ville sainte par rapport à la diaspora aient été suffisamment remarquées. La plupart des historiens du judaïsme ont considérablement exagéré le rôle du judaïsme palestinien à l'époque persane. Ils raisonnent comme si tout le peuple était vraiment retourné de l'exil et si toute l'activité d'Israël était concentrée sur une terre de quelques centaines de kilomètres carrés entre Tekoa, Mitspah et Jéricho.

En réalité, à cette époque les Juifs de Judée ne représentent qu'une partie, la plus petite partie du judaïsme. Et sans doute n'était-ce pas la plus vivante. On considérait autrefois que la deuxième moitié de la période perse avait été pour Israël, sinon un moment de décadence, du moins un temps de silence et d'effacement. La vie de la communauté se serait continuée obscurément, dans des limites fort réduites ; selon la formule fortement imagée de Renan, c'était " le grand sommeil d'Israël." [2] Depuis, la tendance a prévalu parmi les critiques à considérer cette période silencieuse comme un temps d'extraordinaire gestation

[1] Esdras i. 4, conf. Zacharie vi. 10, 11.

[2] Renan, *Histoire d'Israel*, I., p. 184, conf. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*, [2], pp. 168-9.

d'idées. Jérusalem aurait été le champ d'une vie spirituelle et d'une activité littéraire particulièrement intenses, et nous pourrions y constater les mouvements de pensée les plus variés, et d'ailleurs les plus hétérogènes. A côté du ritualisme et du légalisme des prêtres et des scribes, voici la piété mystique des *anavim*, le lyrisme individuel des poètes des psaumes, et d'autre part la spéculation moraliste et déjà rationaliste de la Khokma, puis la littérature apocalyptique qui commence. C'est beaucoup assurément. Que des œuvres aussi diverses que le livre de Job, les poèmes de l'Ebed Jahvé, les Proverbes, les principaux cantiques du Psautier, les livres de Malachie, de Joël, du Deutero-Zacharie, Jonas, le livre du Chroniste, aient été composés à Jérusalem dans le même milieu et dans les mêmes siècles, voilà qui, pour ne pas être tout à fait impossible, n'en laisse pas moins de paraître un peu singulier.

Et si l'on réussit mal à s'expliquer une telle intensité et complexité dans la vie et dans la pensée religieuses, on s'explique plus difficilement encore qu'Israël, rétabli sur la terre de ses pères, s'y soit tellement affermi et multiplé que, dès le IV^e siècle, il est assez fort, assez nombreux pour déborder par delà les frontières du " pays," et pour envoyer l'excédent de sa population à travers le monde oriental. Wellhausen, dans un chapitre de son *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*,[1] a très brillamment décrit cette rapide extension de la race juive, reconquérant peu à peu les montagnes et les vallées de l'ancien territoire de Benjamin et de Juda, puis essaimant vers la Galilée, vers l'Egypte, vers la Mésopotamie, vers la Syrie, etc. Mais vraiment la Judée à la fin de l'époque persane a-t-elle pu être un tel réservoir d'hommes ? En réalité, l'émigration, quelque prolifique que fût la race, devait être nécessairement de dimensions restreintes, et l'on voit pas comment en un siècle elle aurait pu suffire pour coloniser tant de terres nouvelles.

Ici encore il faut tenir compte de l'ancienne diaspora, la diaspora d'Orient que le départ des caravanes de Chechbassar, de Zorobabel et d'Esdras n'avait sans doute pas épuisée, la diaspora d'Egypte qui n'est point morte avec

[1] Vierte Auflage, pp. 202 à 206.

Jérémie. . . . Elle est toujours à l'œuvre, cette diaspora. Jérusalem est bien la capitale spirituelle, la cité du temple . . , en fait *la force active du judaïsme, l'énergie novatrice et conquérante, est ailleurs, elle est parmi les colonies des dispersés qui croissent et se multiplient parmi les peuples.*

Il y a d'abord le groupe de l'Est, la grande diaspora de Mésopotamie, Chaldée, Susiane. Ces juiveries ne sont pas exclusivement composées des descendants des quelques mille judaïtes déportés au temps de Nebukadnetsar. Il ne faut pas oublier qu'il y avait en Orient une diaspora d'origine ephreïmite, et par conséquent antérieure à la diaspora babylonienne. On admet très généralement, mais sans motif suffisant, que les exilés des dix tribus au VIII^e^ siècle perdirent complètement leur nationalité et leur tradition religieuse.[1] Et l'on explique cette décadence par le fait qu'ils n'avaient pas encore le Deutéronome. En réalité, avant comme après le Deutéronome, il y a eu en Orient comme en Occident des groupes ethniques qui ont pu se maintenir pendant des générations et des siècles après avoir été séparés de leur terre et de leur milieu politique. Nous avous quelques raisons de croire que les déportés d'Ephraïm se sont maintenus aussi bien que les colonies grecques de l'antiquité ou les groupes d'Arméniens modernes, et c'est probablement par là qu'il faut expliquer déjà la prétention des *Bene Haggola* du temps d'Ezéchiel qui se considèrent comme " toute la maison d'Israël," [2] et aussi les oracles de Jérémie et d'Ezéchiel annonçant la restauration d'Ephraïm et sa reconciliation avec Juda.[3]

Et à côté des restes des déportés de l'époque assyro-chaldéenne, il faut sans doute tenir compte de certains éléments provenant de l'émigration volontaire, en paticulier des colonies de marchands israélites dont nous apercevons les premières traces au IX^e^ siècle dans le fameux traité d'Achab et de Ben Hadad après la bataille d'Aphek.[4] Les documents nous manquent pour nous décrire la vie intérieure

[1] " In ihren neuen Wohnsitzen verloren sich die exilierten Israeliten spurlos unter den Heiden." Wellhausen, *Israelitische und judische Geschichte* [4], pp. 120-121.

[2] Ezéchiel ii. 3.

[3] Jérémie xxx., xxxi. ; Ezéchiel xxxvii. 15 à 18, xxxvii. 11.

[4] I. Rois xx. 34.

et l'organisation du judaïsme oriental à l'époque perse. Cependant les allusions des Mémoires de Néhémie et d'Esdras nous laissent entrevoir son importance. Ces colonies sont particulièrement prospères et ferventes. A la faveur de la paix achéménide et des conditions éminemment favorables que l'organisation perse avait établies en Orient, elles ont pu librement se développer. Les documents *Mourachou* nous montrent les Juifs établis dans les situations les plus diverses et se livrant activement au traffic dans les cités. Tels nous les retrouverons plus tard dans les livres d'Esther et de Tobit.

D'autre part, les écoles de scribes de Babylonie ont été le point de départ du mouvement réformiste qui devait organiser l'Église juive, et qui, après avoir imposé sa tora à la communauté hierosolymite, finira par s'étendre à tout le judaïsme.

Il y a ensuite la diaspora égyptienne. Cette diaspora est elle aussi d'origine ancienne. A plusiers reprises depuis le VIII^e siècle des groupes éphraïmites ou judaïtes, pour échapper aux grandes catastrophes des invasions assyriennes ou chaldéennes, sont venus se réfugier sur la terre de Mitsrayim. Ils se sont établis comme fellahs sur les bords du fleuve, comme artisans dans la banlieue des cités, soldats au service des princes. La suscription de Jérémie xliv. énumère expressément quatre colonies ou groupes de colonies. "Ceux qui demeure à Migdol, à Takhpanhès, à Noph et au pays de Patros." Et la célèbre prophétie d'Esaïe xix. 18 à 25, qui date au plus tard de la fin du V^e siècle, mais qui pourrait bien être préexilique, annonce que cinq villes du pays d'Egypte parleront la langue de Canaan.

Il y a une vingtaine d'années, Wellhausen enseignait encore comme un fait indiscutable, que l'établissement des réfugiés juifs en Egypte à l'époque de Jérémie avait disparu sans laisser de traces.[1] La diaspora égyptienne n'aurait commencé que sous les premiers Ptolémées. Les découvertes d'Eléphantine nous ont amenés à réviser cette conception. La lettre des Juifs de Yeb parle de la haute antiquité du sanctuaire de Yahvé à Eléphantine.

[1] "Die also heidnisch gesonnenen Juden verloren sich im ägyptischen Heidentum." Wellhausen, *Israëlitische und jüdische Geschichte*, [4], p. 145.

Ce sanctuaire a été bâti au temps des rois d'Egypte, c'est à dire au temps des anciens Pharaons.

En même temps les fameux papyrus nous ont révélé les aspects très particuliers du judaïsme égyptien. Les adorateurs de Yaho représentent un stade arriéré, et avec cela quelque peu déformé de la diaspora. Il s'agit ici d'une colonie que l'influence de la tora n'a pas encore pénetrée, mais qui par contre a subi très fortement l'action de certaines tendances syncrétiques et décadentes. A la fin du V^e^ siècle un pareil cas n'a sans doute pas été tout à fait exceptionnel, et il paraît bien que les juiveries d'Egypte ont gardé pendant longtemps une place à part dans le judaïsme.

Il est permis de se demander si, en dehors de ces deux centres principaux, la diaspora ne s'était pas dès cette époque étendue vers d'autres régions. Les prophéties du Deutéro-Esaïe appelant les captifs de son peuple aux quatre coins de l'horizon (Esaïe xliii. 5, 6 ; xlix. 12), la vision du poète de la nouvelle Jérusalem décrivant le retour des exilés, avec les vaisseaux de Tarsis qui les ramènent depuis les îles lointaines, et l'énumération des nations où doit être publiée la gloire de Yahvé dans l'oracle qui termine le livre d'Esaïe (Esaïe lxvi. 18, 19), attestent que le cercle géographique de la diaspora n'a cessé de s'élargir. Même en faisant dans ces visions la part de l'hyperbole et de la mythologie eschatologique, il reste qu'Israël apparaît comme un peuple disséminé jusqu'aux lointains du monde.

Pour expliquer le rapide développement des colonies de la diaspora, il faut sans doute tenir compte du fait que dans un grand nombre de cas elles ont pu s'assimiler des éléments payens. Le judaïsme n'a pas encore les moeurs du ghetto. A une époque où le règne de la tora n'était pas encore définitivement établi, il a pu se produire bien des infiltrations, des alliances et des mélanges. La tora elle-même ne constituait pas autour d'Israël une barrière absolument fermée ; le zèle pour la pureté de la race et pour l'exacte observance pouvaient s'allier avec l'esprit de prosélytisme, et les ordonnances du code sacerdotal relativement à l'admission des *gerim* dans la communauté,[1] témoignent à

[1] Cof. Nombres ix. 14, xv. 14 à 16, 29, Exode xii. 49.

leur manière, aussi bien que le large programme missionaire du prophète de l'Ebed Yahvé, des préoccupations propagandistes de la diaspora. . . . Israël est vraiment le peuple que cherchent les peuples. " En ces jours-là," dit un oracle de Zacharie " dix hommes des nations de toute langue saisiront un Juif par le pan de son manteau et diront, ' Nous irons avec vous, car nous avons appris que Dieu est avec vous.' " [1]

Il resterait après cela à examiner la question aux aspects très complexes de l'influence de la diaspora sur le développement intérieur du judaïsme. Je dois me contenter d'en indiquer les lignes principales :

Et d'abord quelle a été sa part dans le développement littéraire ? . . . Il est difficile d'admettre que la diaspora, après avoir produit pendant le siècle qui suivit l'exil, des œuvres comme le livre d'Ezéchiel, la rédaction du livre des Rois, les poèmes du Deutero-Esaïe et le Code Sacerdotal, se soit réduite au silence pour des siècles. Les dispersés, en venant à Jérusalem pour le pélerinage, ont porté avec eux, en même temps que leurs offrandes, les pensées qu'ils avaient méditées et les livres qu'ils avaient écrits. Dans les débris qui nous restent de la littérature juive de cette époque il est sans doute difficile de faire le départ entre ce qui est d'origine palestinienne et de ce qui vient de la diaspora. Il est un fait cependant qui s'impose avec toujours plus d'évidence, c'est le caractère exotique de la sagesse juive. Des écrits comme le livre de Job et les collections des Proverbes, et plus tard le Qohélet, sont manifestement étrangers à la tradition hébraïque classique ; par contre, ils ont leurs parallèles dans les littératures de l'ancien Orient et particulièrement dans la littérature de sagesse égyptienne.

D'autre part, la vie religieuse de la diaspora tend à se développer indépendamment du culte du temple et de l'institution religieuse officielle. Malgré que ce culte et ces institutions fussent théoriquement au centre du judaïsme, il reste que dans la pratique ils ne pouvaient avoir qu'une place secondaire. Pour la plupart des fidèles le pélerinage à la cité sainte n'était qu'un acte extraordinaire que l'on

[1] Zacharie viii. 23.

ne se permettait qu'exceptionnellement au cours de l'existence. Dans les conventicules de la diaspora, du moins dans la diaspora orientale, la prière et la méditation de la tora ont remplacé le culte sacrificiel. Ainsi la religion s'intériorise et s'individualise, et c'est une nouvelle piété qui trouve sa plus pure expression dans le lyrisme des derniers poètes du Psautier. En même temps les tendances universalistes du judaïsme continuent à s'affirmer. Israël n'est plus une nation, c'est une église, et, malgré les réactions du fanatisme de race et de l'esprit de secte, un nouvel idéal humain est apparu. Il suffit de rappeler après les visions du Deutero-Esaïe, le pardon annoncé aux payens dans le livre de Jona et la prédication de la Khokma adressée à tous les fils des hommes.

Enfin, n'est-ce pas sous l'influence de la diaspora que va s'accomplir l'évolution syncrétique du judaïsme ? A mesure que nous approchons de l'ère chrétienne, le judaïsme apparaît de plus en plus comme une religion syncrétique. L'étude des origines de la diaspora peut nous montrer en partie par quels processus ce syncrétisme s'est formé. Et déjà à l'époque persane on peut en apercevoir les orientations décisives. Israël, établi à la croisée des chemins des peuples, dans des pays de race et de civilisation mêlées, est spécialement bien situé pour recevoir l'influence des grands mouvements culturels et religieux de ce temps. C'est un fait significatif que le principal centre du syncrétisme oriental, Babylone, a été au V^e^ siècle la grande capitale de la diaspora juive. . . . Dans ce millieu prédisposé à tous les mélanges de race et les fusions de pensée, où justement à cette heure iranisme et sémitisme s'associaient en une synthèse singulièrement riche et féconde, Israël va développer quelques-unes de ses plus magnifiques virtualités. Et d'abord la notion de Dieu se tranforme. Le Yahvé des prophètes se dégage de plus en plus de son cadre national et terrestre pour s'élever dans les lointains inaccessibles du monde lumineux ; il est le grand Dieu du ciel. En même temps entre ce Dieu et le monde des créatures s'organise la multitude innombrable des *Bene haelohim*, et la mythologie astrale de Babylone, et la démonologie de la Perse trouvent droit de cité dans

le judaïsme . . . en attendant qu'apparaisse la conception dualiste du monde, et que pour répondre aux nouveaux besoins d'âme s'affirme la croyance en la résurrection.

Voilà ce que la diaspora va apporter au judaïsme, les pensées et les croyances nouvelles que les enfants d'Israël ont recueillies parmi les peuples.

Quant à l'Église de Judée, groupée autour de Jérusalem dans l'horizon étroit de ses montagnes, il semblait qu'elle fût séparée du monde ; elle n'en recevait pas moins par l'intermédiaire de la diaspora les influences étrangères. Mais après la réforme d'Esdras et de Néhémie, les tendances novatrices étant contenues dans les limites relativement étroites, le judaïsme hiérosolymite deviendra l'agent régulateur qui organisera les apports du dehors et fixera la tradition.

A. CAUSSE.

THE POETRY OF THE PSALMS: ITS LITERARY HISTORY AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE DATING OF THE PSALMS.

I. *Criticism of the Psalms.*

1. The dating of the Psalms is one of the hardest problems in the whole range of Old Testament studies. The reason for this peculiar difficulty lies in the fact that the tradition on the subject which we have in the superscriptions of the Psalms has proved to be quite erroneous, so that in this respect we are thrown back on subjective considerations which can never carry the certainty of a simple tradition. Obviously, then, it is not without manifold mistakes, some of which, indeed, are fundamental, that the student who must rely on such considerations can approach the subject. The result is, that on this question there must always be the greatest differences of opinion between scholars.

2. In the first place, we note the *unreliability of the tradition.* We need allude only briefly to the reasons for this assertion, inasmuch as modern critical study is generally agreed upon it. Apart from the facts that the Hebrew text often contains a double tradition in the superscriptions, that the LXX. frequently disagrees with it, that the Syriac translation is completely at variance with it, showing us that tradition long fluctuated on this point, there are very strong reasons against these statements, especially against the Davidic authorship of many of the Psalms. Even the most conservative critics—*e.g.*, Baethgen and Sellin—venture to indicate only a very small number of Psalms in which

Davidic material is to be looked for; to express these ideas somewhat more boldly is to assert that no Psalm in its present form can be ascribed to David. Even in quite recent days repeated attempts have, of course, been made to render the traditional *l'dawid* ("of David") by "upon David," "in David's manner," "in David's temple-music"; but the historical situations which are sometimes appended to this phrase show that, at any rate in that period, the *l'dawid* was interpreted of Davidic authorship, an interpretation which we have no right to reject.

3. The *data for the determination of the historical period to which a Psalm belongs* are as follows:—

(*a*) *Linguistic Phenomena.*—In not a few Psalms there are Aramaic words or constructions. In many cases this may point to a time when Hebrew was ceasing to be a living language and was giving place to Aramaic. But we cannot always deduce a late origin from an Aramaic expression, for, as Hans Bauer and Leander maintain, Hebrew was from the beginning a mixed language, and possessed Aramaic words from the first. The task of distinguishing Aramaic words which are to be found in the most ancient texts from those which were not introduced till later times, is a problem for the future. In the meantime it is only with the greatest reservation that we should draw the conclusion of a late origin from Aramaisms.

(*b*) The Psalter contains sporadic references to *historical events—e.g.*, to the desolation of the Temple, Ps. lxxiv. But even these generally remain vague, and have been very differently interpreted. More reliable indications are offered by the general conditions. Political circumstances, for instance, may be suggested by the assumption that the people are in slavery, the walls of Jerusalem lie in ruins, the Jews are scattered and live far from home, or social conditions are suggested when we hear that the heathen and the wicked are oppressing and afflicting the righteous. But, naturally, such general statements suggest only a general period, which may extend over many centuries.

(*c*) *Connection with documents* which we can date more accurately than we can the Psalms sometimes appears—*e.g.*, with the sagas of creation and of the patriarchs, especi-

ally with Gen. i., with Deutero-Isaiah, with Chronicles. In these cases the dependence, it is true, need not always lie on the side of the particular Psalm in question. It must be admitted that there are comparatively few such references which can be regarded as certain. They are, for instance, entirely wanting in the " private " Psalms.

(*d*) More recently, attention has been paid to the *history of the religion of Israel*, now better understood than in earlier generations, in addition to the criteria already mentioned, especially by the school of Wellhausen. As we can recognise, for instance, in the German Evangelical Hymnbook the different ages in the history of the Church : first the oldest period and that which followed it, then the period of the Reformation, then Pietism, Rationalism, Modernism, so also the various epochs in the history of Israelite religion are reflected in the Psalms. In certain Psalms—*e.g.*, in those which repudiate sacrifice—the influence of prophecy can be recognised, in others that of the Deuteronomic philosophy of history, that of the Wisdom literature, and even that of the Law. But here, too, the greatest caution is necessary. The close connection made by the Wellhausen school between literary criticism and the history of religion involves the great danger of our determining the historical periods from the sources, and at the same time dating the sources by the historical periods, so that we reach our conclusions by moving in a continuous circle.

Many, then, of these criteria by which we try to establish the age of the Psalms are, in the nature of the case, so doubtful, or lead to such vague results, that the whole edifice which we erect upon them must be extremely unsafe.

4. We have, further, a number of *sources of error*, of which only one need be mentioned below.

(*a*) Since the available material is so scanty, it is humanly intelligible that students cannot be satisfied with what we can know for certain, and have wished to know more than, unfortunately, is granted to us by the nature of the case. The following is a mistake of this kind. The author of Ps. xlii. (" Therefore do I remember thee from the land of Jordan, and the Hermons ") wrote his poem in northern

Palestine ; so much we can regard as certain. But attempts have been made to ascertain the *name* of the author, and it has been conjectured that he was one of the exiles in the time of Jechoniah, who must have passed through this northern district on their deportation to Babylon (Baethgen), or Onias III. who may have passed the same spot on his banishment to Syria (Hitzig). Such an opinion assumes that we are in a position to state the names of all Jewish poets who were once in the north, in order then to make our choice among them! Such attempts to date the Psalms as exactly as possible are especially characteristic of Ewald and Hitzig, and have not yet disappeared among our most recent scholars, *cf.* Duhm and Paul Haupt.

(*b*) In this connection it is a peculiar fact that conjecture has fixed upon persons of *political* distinction, even when, as in Ps. xlii., the content of the Psalm is entirely non-political. How is it that the choice has fallen upon such political personalities, kings, high priests, and the like? Just because we have information about these persons in other sources, while private persons, including poets, remain in obscurity. But as a matter of principle we should insist that poems ought not to be dated by political criteria, unless their content is political.

(*c*) A similar case occurs when the "wicked" of Ps. i. are connected with the "lawless" of I. Macc.—*i.e.*, the Hellenists (Olshausen) or the *ḥasidim* of other Psalms with the "Hasidæans," a pious sect of the Maccabæan period.

(*d*) It may seem strange that from ancient to modern times authorship has been ascribed repeatedly to the *Maccabeans;* this also is to be explained by the fact that we have very full information on this period, far fuller than on the preceding centuries. Here too, then, the accident of tradition has misled students.

5. The school of Wellhausen generally places the Psalms in the *post-exilic* period. We are all familiar with the saying of old Reuss: "The Prophets are older than the Law, and the Psalms are younger than either." The reasons for this arrangement are as follows:—

(*a*) "Since the Psalter was the hymnbook of the community of the second Temple, the question is not as to

whether there are any post-exilic poems, but as to whether there are any pre-exilic pieces in it." So Wellhausen. Accordingly Stade held the presence of pre-exilic Psalms to be possible, though improbable ; Cheyne disputed it altogether.

The basis of this conclusion is undoubtedly correct : it was in the community of the last pre-Christian centuries that Psalter found special favour ; many of the individual poems may emanate from this period. But we certainly ought not to go further ; even in the modern German Hymnbook there are a great many hymns which are far older than modern times.

(*b*) In the next place, we must beware of the shibboleths "*pre-exilic*" and "*post-exilic.*" Peculiarly critical errors are commonly due to the form of the question, and for the Psalms this form of question is wrong. It would only be legitimate if it could first be shown that the Babylonian captivity formed the most important line of demarcation in the history of the religious poetry. There is, however, no *a priori* necessity for such an assumption. The Thirty Years' War made the strongest impression on German life, especially in certain spheres, but it forms no line of demarcation in the history of evangelical Dogmatics.

(*c*) But is it possible that Psalm-composition did not *begin* at all till the exile ? So Stade says : " Before the exile a suitable soil for Psalm-composition was practically non-existent." " We cannot say what element in the pre-exilic cultus could have given the occasion for the rise of poetry like that of the Psalms." Of this view I propose to speak later.

(*d*) Cornill essays the argumentum *a silentio*, a favourite with the school of Wellhausen, though it very easily misleads, and points out " the fact, as strange as it is undeniable, that the whole pre-exilic literature of Israel does not show the slightest harmony with Psalm-composition, nor the least trace of its influence." Of this, too, more later.

6. Another objection to the antiquity of Psalm-composition, which Stade especially has maintained, is this : The *individualistic piety*, which is so common a feature in the Psalms, cannot be explained on the basis of the pre-exilic period. The general theory of history which underlies

this opinion is this: In the older, pre-exilic, period, and even in the prophets, the *nation* is the subject of religion; in later, post-exilic times, especially after Ezekiel, it is the *individual.* So Job, the Proverbs, and also the Psalms are to be assigned to the post-exilic "Judaism." Now, it is quite true that in the historical books, and also in the prophets, little enough is said of private persons, but this is to be explained by the character of these writings. History deals primarily with the nation and with its rulers, not with the private person, and even the prophets were politicians, for whose thought their nation was central, whence they could not speak so well of individuals. But the Sagas, even the most ancient, in which the religion of the ordinary man appears, draw a very different picture; here individualism, even in religion, plays its part from the first. There is, then, nothing to be said for the theory that ancient religion disregarded the individual. On the other hand, in earlier times, the society, family, tribe, community, nation, were of greater importance than the individual, whilst it is in a later period that the position begins to be reversed. But this acceptance of the value of the individual is a slow and gradual process, achieved through a more general transformation of the national spirit, not through a single catastrophe or the activity of a single person. The first great independent religious personalities whom we know are the earliest prophets and their immediate successors, men like Moses, Elijah, Amos, Isaiah, and so forth. If, then, we find individual personality so strongly developed in the Psalms, in the Proverbs, in Job, we are by no means compelled to place those productions after the exile on this ground alone.

The result of the foregoing discussion is that, while we have found a few significant forms of evidence as to the dates of the Psalms, we must yet remain in much uncertainty on the subject.

II. *The Literary History of the Psalms.*

It is from *literary history* that we obtain the possibility of fresh lines of evidence as to the dating of the Psalms.

It is true that the study of the literary history of the Psalms does not aim properly at providing a chronology of these poems ; its purpose is rather to advance the understanding of them, and to exhibit their inner history by means of a *natural arrangement.* But even this fresh grouping does at the same time make important contributions also to the dating. Naturally this new method of work does not invalidate all that has gone before ; rather must we strive that no grain of truth which has been discovered along other lines should ever be lost again. On the other hand, we thus obtain a means of testing the older studies in literary *criticism*, and, naturally, of exposing much of it as erroneous.

For many decades I have been trying to bring light and air into the primæval jungle of the Psalms, and to find such an *orderly arrangement* of these poems as may be provided by the nature of the case. The grouping which I have discovered is based on the *classes* (Gattungen), Greek *genē*, French *genres.* In future studies in many spheres, especially in deciding chronological questions, it will be of universal importance to proceed *with the greatest strictness* in the determination of the *classes.* Already I think I can see signs that the coming generation will pay inadequate attention to obvious, fundamental principles, and will follow its imagination much too readily and much too far. I hold it my bounden duty in this place to utter a warning against this danger, for I fear lest otherwise the whole of this branch of study may deliquesce into arbitrary and capricious theories.

2. We can speak of a literary "*class*," only when *three distinct indications* are present together.

(*a*) Since all ancient writing had its origin in the *spoken word*, and formed a part of the national life, we must first determine *the place which the "class" held in that life.* The basic fact for the literary study of the Psalms is that these poems spring originally from *worship.* These Psalms must be assigned to a class whose common element is some definite divine service.

These services involve definite religious ideas and moods. This element in the class may most easily be recognised

by modern students, since for some time past *hymns of praise* (Hymnen), *hymns of sorrow* (Klagelieder), *hymns of thanksgiving* (Danklieder), and others have been distinguished with great insight, though with no fundamental certainty. Ideas and moods are admittedly the things which possess the greatest freedom of movement; they change in most varied and easy fashion. We must, therefore, be most careful not to institute a "*class*" on the basis of these phenomena. So Mowinckel, in spite of his genius and penetrating mind, has made a bad mistake in grouping together certain Psalms which exhibit any kind of connection with one another, and so believes he has discovered a vastly comprehensive structure in the "Accession-Psalms." But the study of the classes demands far more certain criteria.

(*b*) So much the more valuable is it to be able to rely on a criterion which can be infalliably recognised; that is the *formulæ* of the class. These include definite, constantly repeated, syntactical turns, invariable expressions, images, etc., especially at the beginning and end. We shall still have to face another struggle before these observations are generally recognised, for they awaken a kind of aversion very different from that which was current in earlier times. But the study of the classes in the realm of the Old Testament is quite impossible without investigation of such formulæ, for in ancient times, and especially in ancient Israel, the greatest importance attaches to custom and usage, and so also to literary customs—*i.e.*, to style.

3. We shall now very briefly describe the *four main classes in the Psalms.* They are (*a*) "*Hymns of Praise*" (Hymnen), (*b*) "*Private Hymns of Thanksgiving*" (Danklieder des Einzelnen), (*c*) "*National Hymns of Sorrow*" (Klagelieder des Volkes), (*d*) "*Private Hymns of Sorrow*" (Klagelieder des Einzelnen).

(*a*) First *the Hymns of Praise.* They were sung by sacred choirs or as solos by trained singers to exhilarating music on a holy day, at festal sacrifices, or on other solemn occasions. The subject of such hymns of praise is Yahweh Himself, His greatness, His majesty, and His grace. There

may be a description of His power as the Creator of the universe, His awful self-manifestation in the terrors of volcanic action, His dwelling in Heaven, His mythical deeds in the primæval world, His faithful care for Israel. The dominant mood is enthusiasm for God in His majesty and reverence before God in His awfulness. Their aim is to give pleasure to the God whom they praise in such exuberant terms.

(*b*) *Private hymns of thanksgiving* are based on a similar mood. If a man has escaped a great danger—the sick who has been cured, the prisoner who has been liberated from his dungeon, the shipwrecked traveller who has come safely to land—he will bring his sacrifice of thanksgiving into the sanctuary, and, as he presents it, will sing a song in which he expresses his gratitude aloud before all the people. About him stands a crowd of relatives and acquaintances who share in the sacred acts ; but he, with the " cup of salvation " in his hand, sings his Psalm even before the sacrifice is offered. In it he recounts the circumstances of his misfortune, his distress, his invocation of Yahweh and his rescue by the God, and then invites them to a ceremonial meal.

(*c*) Next we come to the *national hymns of sorrow.* If any kind of public distress, oppression by an enemy, drought, scarcity, or plague, has reduced the nation to despair, a festival of sorrow is held. The whole population of the country gathers at the sanctuary and performs all kinds of expiatory ritual : men tear their garments, cast themselves into the dust, fast, weep, and wail. But the central feature of the festival is the hymn of sorrow, in which men lay siege to God with passionate entreaty that he may be stirred to pity and remove their distress.

(*d*) Commonest of all in the Psalter is a fourth class, the *hymn of sorrow of the righteous individual.* In many traits this resembles the foregoing : here too it is a question of heavy misfortune which God may graciously turn to prosperity. But the fundamental difference is that those poems speak of the distress and deliverance of the nation, these of the fate of the *individual.* The Psalms prefer not to use language too concrete, and many details from the actual

experience are omitted. This is to be explained by the fact that they originally belong to divine worship, and go back to cultic formulæ. In this class, however, most of the allusions refer to the *sickness* of the worshipper. Disease, especially when it is severe and dangerous, is, in the thought of the ancient world, something which comes directly from God, a "divine stroke," and can only be removed by the Deity Himself. Very often, therefore, the patient appeared in the sanctuary in order to have a cure performed. In later times similar prayers will have been offered by other sufferers—prisoners, persons who have been charged with crime or slandered, men who have suffered shipwreck, have lost their way, or have been exiled. Here we must observe a clear distinction; some are *contrite*, recognising in their misfortune the just punishment of God, others, in direct contrast, maintain their *innocence* in vigorous language. To expiatory rites will have belonged the first sub-class, the *penitential Psalms*, the second, the *hymns of innocence* (Unschuldsliedern), to ceremonies in which purity from sin is attested.

4. It is impossible for us to elaborate this short sketch of these classes, to which a few smaller ones must be added, in the full richness of their manifold types. Only a few words about the *formulæ* must be added. The two classes of hymns of sorrow are readily identified by the fact that they begin with a petition. "Deliver *us*, Yahweh," is the beginning of a national hymn of sorrow, and the private hymn of sorrow frequently begins with the sentence "Deliver *me*, Yahweh." By far the most usual beginning for a hymn of thanksgiving is: "I will thank Yahweh"—naturally all this with many variations of expression in individual Psalms. By way of illustration the *formulæ of the hymn of praise* will receive here a somewhat more extended treatment, inasmuch as we shall have to use our observations on this head below.

The hymn of praise normally begins with an *introduction*, whose formulæ are commonly repeated at the *conclusion* of the whole. This introduction takes the form of an *invitation* to song and exultation, usually in the imperative plural, running, therefore, "Sing ye," "Exult ye," "Praise

ye," in many varied forms. Whilst all these formulæ assign the introduction to a number of singers (therefore to a choir), there is also a formula which attests the performance of the whole as a solo: "I will sing," "exult," "thank," etc. The name of God, to whom the hymn of praise is addressed, is indispensable: "Sing ye to *Yahweh*," or "I will sing to *Yahweh*." Or prominence may be given to the deeds or attributes of the God for the sake of which the hymn of praise is addressed to Him: "Sing ye to Yahweh's name," "His majesty," "might," "grace." The object of a hymn of praise is often indicated in an accusative sentence or a causal clause, introduced in Hebrew by *ki:* "Sing ye unto Yahweh *for* He exalteth Himself on high," and so frequently. Another method of passing from the "introduction" to the "body" of the poem, is to attach laudatory epithets *in apposition* to the name of the God: "I will exalt thee, O Yahweh, my strength." Very common is a *participle* which has to be rendered in modern languages by a relative sentence: "Sing ye to Yahweh, *who* dwelleth in Zion," "Thank ye the Lord of Lords, *who* doeth great marvels." The main portion of the poem, which properly follows, consists for the most part of sentences in which *the name of Yahweh is the subject;* the predicates describe Yahweh's famous attributes and deeds in the past, the present, and the future. Illustrations are: "Yahweh is merciful and gracious," "Yahweh is righteous in all His ways"; these, therefore, are nominal sentences. There are, on the other hand, also verbal sentences of many kinds: "Yahweh maketh poor and maketh rich," "Yahweh hath chosen Zion for Himself," "He spake, and it was done." To these must be added a whole series of other formulæ—*e.g.*, many rhetorical questions: "How precious is thy grace," "Who is like unto Yahweh among the gods?" etc.

All this, however, is but a short sketch of the wealth of formulæ which we recognise in the Hymns of praise. And, like the hymns of praise, all the remaining classes of Psalms must be identified according to their formulæ. I have attempted to describe all these formulæ of the religious lyric in my "*Einleitung in die Psalmen*," and I

hope that when this paper is read, the first part of this book may already be in the hands of my hearers.

III. *The Dating of the Psalms.*

From a description of the classes of the Psalms we can proceed to a *dating*.

1. In the first place, the question has shifted through the study of the classes. In these altered circumstances we are not so much studying each individual Psalm as such (though this must not be neglected, and has, I think, been done in my Commentary on the Psalms), but a more comprehensive problem faces us ; our final object is the determination of the *classes*. And even in the question of the dating, it is not now the age of the individual Psalm that is our problem, but we aim at discovering the *history of the classes*. So we shall soon find ourselves on more solid ground : it is often difficult or impossible to say when the individual Psalm was first sung, but we may yet be able to discover the general history of religious poetry and its classes.

2. With this object in view, we shall first attempt to draw conclusions *from the classes themselves*. That is to say, this material, whose items—as has just been suggested—have been merely laid alongside one another, we shall now treat, as it were, stereoscopically—*i.e.*, describe them in relation to their inner history. Here, too, from a wealth of illustrations a few must be selected.

(*a*) In Old Testament literature we notice a gradual expansion of the units through a whole series of different classes. Thus at the beginning of the evolution of the narrative literature we have quite short sagas (*e.g.*, the Babel and Penuel stories), at the end we have them as developed as the history of Joseph—a regular novel. A similar phenomenon appears also in the prophetic literature, which begins with quite short individual utterances and ends with longer speeches. This is true also of the Proverbs, and we perceive a similar development in lyric poetry, even in the religious lyric. The song of Miriam, that of the Seraphim in Is. vi., and others, are quite short,

while at the end of the whole evolution stands a Psalm like the 119th, whose poet obviously takes a pride in being able to fill the space of 176 lines. Such a consideration is not, of course, necessarily to be accepted as an infallible criterion of age, but it is important if, as in the case of Ps. cxix., it reinforces other considerations.

(*b*) To this more external criterion we must add that we very often notice also an *inner expansion*. The earlier age contented itself in the introduction to the hymn of praise with a simple invitation—" Sing ye," " Exult ye," " Praise ye," etc. Later poets display a whole mass of such expressions together, just as the later Gothic architect endlessly repeats the form peculiar to his style, the pointed arch. Closely allied to this is the following phenomenon: the hymn of praise frequently mentions the persons who are to perform the poem: " Sing to Yahweh, ye sons of God," but to an age of greater development it is not enough to speak here of a single group only, so it combines a number, and often so many that the whole poem is filled with them, as in the " Song of the Three Children." And this is true for all the classes: at the beginning stands the short, simple introduction, at the end one which is broadly expanded and complicated. We may notice a whole mass of such lines of development.

(*c*) To this we must add that in the earliest times the individual, with his personal righteousness, is comparatively insignificant, but later he dominates the relevant classes and tries to express his inmost self. The hymn of praise, for example, had originally a magnificent *objectivity;* the poet forgot himself and thought only of the God whom he celebrated. On the other hand, the singer of Ps. ciii. describes, in the form of a hymn of praise, an experience through which *he himself* has just passed. Or the hymn of praise recounts—this theme is a special favourite—the creation of the world; but the poet of Ps. cxxxix. extols the creation of his own body as the greatest marvel in the universe. It is, then, also of special significance that this whole poem obviously sprang from formal worship and originally accompanied its usages, but penetrated later into the private life of the individual. It seems to me

quite impossible to deny this change, as my friend Mowinckel has tried to do ; I believe, on the contrary, that this is the most important incident in the history of Psalm-poetry in general. One of the most characteristic differences between the different periods in the Psalter is that a number of the poems have their proper place in *worship*, whilst others speak disrespectfully of its forms.

(*d*) This development of the personal life in Psalm poetry expresses itself also in the fact that the *classes themselves* undergo all kinds of alterations. The oldest classes, which had their home in worship, were quite pure and simple, just because they had before them a definite, prescribed function, and issue in a traditional cycle of thought and in stereotyped formulæ. Our study will always be able rightly to assign pieces of this kind. But later periods, which were no longer (or no longer so strongly) bound up with worship, and cherished a rich spiritual life, could not express within the prescribed narrow limits of a single class the whole manifold diversity of their inner experience. The result was a large number of "*mixtures*." For instance, the kindred classes of the hymn of praise and the hymn of thanksgiving had an attraction for one another : the author of Ps. lxvi. in vv. 1-12, prefixes a more general hymn of praise to the hymn of thanksgiving, in which he relates his own deliverance from deep distress. Or the exact opposite may take place ; two pieces which are not merely different, but which even express contradictory moods, may be deliberately combined, in order to produce a powerful effect by the very contrast ; so the plaintive hymn of sorrow might be expanded with passages from the joyous hymn of praise, as was already common in Babylonia. In the end that kind of mixture was carried to such an extent, that it almost resulted in formlessness. Lest, however, we fall into utter confusion, our study must deal with such mixed poems last of all. So, for instance, a Psalm like Ps. cxix., where the most varied classes appear side by side, but without co-ordination, could only have been regarded as the masterpiece of Psalm structure, at the end of the whole.

(*e*) Parallel to this goes another development, which

springs from the same soil: "*liturgies*" were performed. From the earliest times antiphonal singing was employed to enliven worship, as, for example, in the middle section of Ps. xxiv. Then passages belonging to *different classes* were set side by side in these antiphonal hymns, and this type of performance became a favourite special in later and in the latest periods. There the heart-rending lament of a whole nation may ring out, until the divine oracle imparts a consoling answer, and all tears are dried. There was, indeed, a whole series of such "liturgies," almost comparable to the "cantatas" of the great Bach himself.

The Psalms themselves, then, give us insight into a great history; varied lines of development, sometimes parallel, sometimes crossing one another, become clear to us. Yet all these considerations suffer from one significant disadvantage: none of them offers an exact *indication of time*. We can distinguish between an earlier and a later, but this method gives us no hint of the point at which this "later" began. We cannot thus mention any date.

3. Such a chronology proper we can only reach when we introduce *another kind of consideration*. Just as hitherto the individual Psalm has been treated far too much as an individual piece, and its connection with certain others has been overlooked, so also it has been largely forgotten that the Psalms are closely related to other poems *outside the Psalter*. Here, too, the historical study of literature steps in, and shows that the classes of the Psalms often re-appear in other books. So we find poems as closely as possible allied to the Psalms here and there in the narrative books; we need only think of the songs of Miriam, Hannah, David (II. Sam. xxii.), Hezekiah, Jonah. In the Book of Job there are many sections which have grown obviously out of Psalm poetry, and we must add a great number of lyric passages from the Prophetic books. If we look more exactly at the many poems in question, we discover, to our own astonishment, that we are dealing almost everywhere with the same classes which we have previously found in the Psalter. And the more exactly we have previously determined the formulæ of the classes, the more certain, and, therefore, the more impressive, do these

considerations become. Thus the Song of Miriam : " Sing ye unto Yahweh, for high doth He exalt himself," is, clearly, a hymn of praise ; " sing ye " is the ordinary introduction of such a hymn, and the main body of the poem normally begins with a " for." In the same way, the Seraphim's song in Is. vi. : " Holy is Yahweh," most certainly constitutes a hymn of praise : such sentences, whose subject is the name of the God and whose predicate consists of all manner of praiseworthy attributes of Yahweh, usually forms the main body of the hymn of praise. We mentioned above the sentences : " Yahweh is merciful," " Yahweh is righteous." The admitted insertions in the Book of Amos are recognisable through the participles which glorify the majesty of Yahweh, so characteristic of the hymn of praise, *cf.* Am. iv. 13, " *Who* fashioned the heavens and created the wind," etc. So also Job xxvi. 7 ff : " *Who* stretcheth out the north above the void, *who* hangeth the earth upon nothing, *who* bindeth up the waters in his thick clouds," etc. In addition to such " hymns of praise," there are also " *hymns of thanksgiving* "—*e.g.*, that of David (II. Sam. xxii.), that of Jonah, that of Hezekiah. There are " *private hymns of sorrow*," especially in Job ; the so-called " Monologues of Jeremiah " are hymns of sorrow, so also Lam. iii. ; Lam. v. is a national hymn of sorrow.

(*b*) We thus reach an extraordinary wealth of material, covering many centuries. Hebrew poetry starts with such poems : the lyric classes begin with the song of Miriam, and even the song of Deborah has a few characteristic traits of the hymn of praise : " I unto Yahweh, I will sing." So they continue throughout the whole of the literary history down to the Apocrypha, where Jesus Sirach contains much of this type, to the " Psalms of Solomon," also to the N.T., where the Magnificat and the Benedictus have the form of hymns of praise, the Gnostic " Odes of Solomon," and the prayers of the Synagogue, even at the present day. The comparison of this truly enormous mass of material and the arrangement of the whole according to classes, is of special value, nay, is indispensable, for the explanation of the Psalms, because thus we obtain reliable parallels for many individual passages in the Psalms which are

difficult to understand. And they provide also an indispensable basis for the problems with which we are immediately concerned. For while the poems in the Psalter have been handed down to us without any trustworthy tradition as to the time of their composition, for the Psalms outside the Psalter we have a mass of such indications. Here and there we can date a poem to the very year : it was in the year when king Uzziah died that Isaiah heard the Seraphim sing their song. We can state definitely the time when Jeremiah lived and composed his " Monologues." We know, too, the time of Deutero-Isaiah and of his hymns of praise, and the date of the " Psalms of Solomon " can be ascertained, etc.

We have already seen that we can sketch an inner history of the Psalm-classes ; we may now add all kinds of indications of date from the Psalms outside the Psalter. Our next task is to combine the two, and so reach a proper literary history of the Psalms, in which *the beginning, the climax, and the end* of the history of each class may be reliably dated. In the nature of the case, *exact figures* can but rarely be given in this branch of study, for the literary formulæ are current through extraordinarily long periods. Formulæ persist for centuries, and this happened on Israelite soil ; the ancient formula for the introduction of the hymn of praise (" Sing ye to Yahweh ") still appears in the " Song of the Three Children."

(*c*) We ask, first of all, *at what point in the history of Israel did the classes appear?* This we can gather from the poems introduced into our *oldest narratives*, also from those *prophetic sections* which allude to them or imitate them, finally also from certain passages which depict the *place* these songs hold *in the life* of the people. We have already mentioned above the *oldest hymns of praise* which we possess ; these are the song of Miriam, an introductory section in the song of Deborah, and, in the prophets, the song of the Seraphim in Isaiah. We may regard the well-known " *Hallelujah* " as the oldest beginning of the hymn of praise, though it comes to us first from writings of a much later time, it bears in its form the character of a primitive source of the lyric. In distinction from the

artistic song proper, it is a "*cry*," which, with rising enthusiasm, the whole multitude of the people sings, shouts, screams. Moreover, the oldest sources available to us testify to the *place in life* taken by the hymn of praise ; Amos v. 21 ff speaks of festivals, offerings, and harp-music together, and Hos. ix. 1 speaks of the exultation of the people at the threshing-floor. There is, therefore, not the least reason why hymns of praise whose contents suggest that they are very ancient, such as the thunderstorm Psalm (Ps. xxix.) or the Sun-hymn (Ps. xix. 2-7), or the first part of Ps. lxxxix., should not be assigned to the earliest period.

A word, too, about the *national hymns of sorrow*. We hear with peculiar frequency of all kinds of days of mourning observed by the people in times of special distress, so that we have the best possible information about these festivals. The school of Wellhausen has overlooked this whole chapter, in the erroneous supposition that the oldest religion was predominantly happy. We hear of these festivals of sorrow in the earliest times ; the Elijah-saga tells of a national fast, which was the occasion for the judicial murder of Naboth. Not a few references to such fasts occur in the prophets—*e.g.*, Am. v. 16, Is. xxii. 12. A typical illustration of a song for such a national day of sorrow is Jer. iii. 2 ff ; still older is Hos. vi. 1-3.

Private songs are not so well attested from early times. But the "Thank ye Yahweh, for He is good, for His mercy endureth for ever," familiar to us from the Psalter, is already used in Jer. xxxiii. 11, and describes the joyful song of those who bring the thank-offering to the Temple. The "monologues" of Jeremiah, as we have already briefly remarked, are to be understood as an appropriation and an extension of the private hymns of sorrow (W. Baumgartner). The idea which used to hold the field, that the composers of the hymns of sorrow imitated the prophets, and that these were the earliest Psalmists, scorns any treatment along lines of literary history ; for, as a matter of fact, a class never owes its origin to the activity of a single individual, but to the general co-operation of whole groups of men.

All things considered, then, we may say that Psalm-

composition belongs to the earliest period of Israel's history. And this position, which may appear strange enough to our generation, is in no way incredible, but corresponds to the nature of the case : this poetry, which belongs to worship, is as old as worship itself, and springs from the same age as the national saga, justice, the Torah, and all other treasures of the national life. It is absolutely unthinkable that Israel, a people with such rich poetic gifts and such love for poetry, should ever have wanted song, especially in worship. The idea, now so widely spread, that Psalm composition as such owes its origin to the period after the Babylonian exile, in no way corresponds to the actual facts.

(*d*) We have next to determine to what period we are to assign the freer development of the Psalm style. We may recognise this from two examples, both of which we can date with some certainty. The first is Lam. iii., a highly artificial alphabetic Psalm from the time of the exile. It belongs to the class of the private hymns of sorrow, but a large section of a national hymn of sorrow (vv. 40-50) has been inserted. A specimen of such considerable inorganic mixture belongs to a time when Psalm composition has long passed its zenith, and this was, therefore, true of the period of the exile. And the same thing is true of Ps. xviii., a royal Psalm which (as we shall discuss later) must be assigned to the period of the Judæan monarchy. Here,too, we observe a remarkably wide range, a broad extension of the whole, and also the mixture of different classes, in this instance those of the hymn of thanksgiving and of the hymn of praise. From this Psalm, too, it is clear that the climax of the development has already been reached.

A word may also be said about the *origin and development of the liturgy*. We have one as early as Hos. vi. 1-6, where the national hymn of sorrow is answered by the divine oracle ; this must have been the oldest form of the liturgy. Later it becomes particularly common. We have extended and peculiarly beautiful liturgies in Isaiah xxxiii., in the conclusion of the Book of Micah, and especially in Trito-Isaiah. It will have been the performance of such liturgies

which gave worship its wonderful charm in the Persian period.

(*e*) We must, further, deal briefly with the influence of prophecy and of the Law on Psalm composition.

Prophecy, the giant whose thought completely revolutionised the religion of Israel, and whose forms of speech are instinct with primæval vigour, exercised over the religion of Israel an influence which it is impossible to overestimate, and which none can overlook; and this influence makes itself felt in a large part of the poetry of the Psalms. We recognise this even in the forms: Ps. i. is an imitation of a much more profound and brilliant prophetic section, Jer. xvii. 5-8, and Ps. l. presents us with a proclamation of the divine will in prophetic style. Under prophetic influence the Psalmists learnt to speak of that which dominated all hearts in their day, the great future when the Almighty should end all the suffering of His people, and "turn again their captivity." Thus eschatology is introduced into Psalm-poetry, whether the righteous poets imitated the form of Yahweh's speeches at the last judgment (Ps. lxxxii.), or whether they (also on the model of the prophets) filled their hymns of praise and their liturgies with eschatological content. Of yet greater significance is it that the spirit of these poems, which originally had their root in worship, more or less drifted away from it, and soared to a loftier piety, in which the outward act is not the real means of satisfying God: "Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving; so shalt thou pay thy vows unto the Most High" (Ps. l. 14). This movement towards spirituality, which, in our judgment, gives the Psalms their peculiar value and raises them almost to the level of the Gospel, is certainly closely allied to the thought of the prophets, and owes its origin to their influence.

To what period must we assign this transformation within the Psalm-poetry? Surely to that in which the prophetic ideas began to be powerful among the people. Certainly the frightful catastrophe of the *exile*, and all that *suffering* which began with it and was to endure for centuries, had the strongest influence on the heart of the community, and in terrible fashion authenticated the

preaching of the prophets, as we hear expressly of a "conversion" of the nation in the exile. Then, too, will the prophetic influence have had its fullest effect on Psalm-poetry; but we must not forget that the prophets, as the Deuteronomic legislation shows, had had the strongest possible influence on their people even before the exile. The *single* event of the exile, as such, must not be overestimated. All this shows that there is at bottom an element of soundness in the judgment of the venerable Reuss, according to which prophecy is older than the Psalms, as long as we are considering the *later* Psalm-poetry, though this judgment must be directly reversed if we think of the oldest liturgical Psalms, which are far anterior to the great historical prophecy.

Quite mistaken, however, is the view, widely accepted to-day as self-evident, that *the Law is older than the Psalms*. Naturally, by the term Law we do not mean the oral Torah, whose origin is contemporary with that of cultic Psalmody, but the great *legal system* (D, H, P), and what we call the *legal spirit* of Judaism. But it was probably one of the most serious mistakes ever made in this sphere when the "legal spirit" was regarded as a significant characteristic of the Psalms. On the contrary, the lyric classes in their oldest form have nothing in common with that spirit; and it was only occasionally introduced into them in the latest period. The phenomenon that the Law to some extent takes possession of the Psalms is first to be noticed in poems as young as Ps. cxix., where, one by one, the original lyric motives are converted to the new spirit: for these observations I may refer to my commentary. From such an illustration we can see that Psalm-poetry was not erected on the foundation of the Law, but rather that it was built afresh throughout on the later appearance of the joy in the Law. This, as we see at once, is of fundamental importance for the dating of Psalm-composition.

(*f*) At the end of this section we must not fail to speak of the *royal Psalms;* for these form one of the most certain bases for the dating of the Psalms. To be sure, he who studies many modern attempts at the dating of the Psalms may well feel, in view of the great uncertainty which

prevails, that it would be best to be silent on this subject; but it is just at this point that the study of the classes may show what it can do. The school of Wellhausen has here also started from its general presupposition that the Psalms are post-exilic, and has quite logically concluded that the royal Psalms cannot refer to the kings of Israel or of Judah, but must be explained in some other way. In this self-imposed extremity various conjectures have been made; it may be some world-king like the Ptolemies, it may be the Maccabean priest-princes, it may be the Jewish community which is here called "king." And the magnitude of the confusion thus produced appears even in the great Wellhausen, who here offers four different explanations of eight Psalms. In contrast to this the method of literary history requires that the whole of the homogeneous material should receive uniform treatment and find a common explanation. To the royal Psalms must be added the intercession for a king which is found at the end of a few Psalms—viz., Pss. xxviii., lxi., lxiii., lxxxiv.; I. Sam. ii. 10. The terms applied to the prince in all these passages are almost everywhere the same. He is called "the king," "Yahweh's king," "Annointed," "Servant," he sits enthroned "before Yahweh," his residence is Zion, his God is everywhere Yahweh, his people are called "Jacob," "Yahweh's people and inheritance," his ancestor is David, etc. If this common material is taken all together, there can be no doubt that all these poems refer to *native kings*. They cannot be foreign world-rulers, for these are not descended from David, and do not sit enthroned in Zion before Yahweh. Just as little can they be Maccabeans, for these were not of the house of David. There can reasonably be no question whatever of the community; Israel is never called "Yahweh's king" in the O.T. So at the end of the whole discussion there remains only the most obvious suggestion of all, which could have been made at the very first—namely, *that the kings of these Psalms are kings of Israel and Judah*. People have been surprised by the violent exaggerations which are usual in these poems. But elsewhere in Israel men preferred to speak of the king in such hyperbole; in later passages a

world-empire is ascribed to David, Ps. lxxxix. 26-28; Is. lv. 3. Many moderns fail to understand how the king in Ps. cx. can be called a *priest*, but many indications in the O.T. prove that in ancient times even priestly rights were ascribed to the king. Under the influence of priestly redaction, which sought to confer the priesthood on the priests alone, this was driven into the background, but could not be wholly eliminated. Again, it has been said that Melchizedek (Ps. cx.), who elsewhere appears only in the late legend of Gen. xiv., could not possibly have been mentioned in a pre-exilic Psalm. But why should we not reach the opposite conclusion, and argue, from the mention of Melchizedek in a royal Psalm, that the figure originates in ancient tradition? And so forth. So all contrary arguments fall to the ground.

We have already noticed that a few Psalms contain *prayers of intercession for the king*, which are obviously later additions. So for these poems also we reach with certainty a dating within the period of the monarchy.

4. These conclusions receive entirely fresh reinforcement from observations made in a totally different sphere—namely, that of the *Babylonian-Assyrian* and *Egyptian religious lyrics*. We have deliberately refrained from referring to this subject, until now, almost at the end of the discussion, in order to avoid giving the false impression that the treatment of the Biblical Psalm on lines of literary history owes its origin to comparison with foreign poetry. By this arrangement we hope to have shown that the study of the classes has grown on its own roots. But it is obvious that, now that these Babylonian and Egyptian poems have once become known to us, their comparison with Biblical poetry is an urgent task for scholarship. But such a comparison can only be fruitful on the basis of literary history; even the Babylonian classes, in which that literature is so rich, must first be thoroughly studied, and that in the light of their linguistic formulæ, before they can be compared with the Hebrew poems, and up to the present this investigation has only been undertaken to a very slight extent. Every conjecture, then, which has yet been made on this subject, whether a historical connection between the two literatures,

has been accepted or denied—all this must be regarded as a preliminary enquiry. Yet even now we can indicate the main lines which the study must follow: these are, first of all, Egyptian, and especially the Babylonian-Assyrian *hymns of praise* and passages related thereto, whose formulæ are closely allied to those of the Bible, then the Babylonian-Assyrian *hymns of sorrow*, of which the same thing is true. Less relevant are the *private hymns of thanksgiving*, of which we have examples in both literatures—*e.g.*, the so-called "Job-Psalm," about which the opinions of the Assyriologists still vary so much, is, from its form, clearly a Psalm of thanksgiving. But very closely related to one another are the Biblical and the extra-Biblical *royal Psalms*, and that places the final stamp of truth on the explanation of these Psalms which we have just propounded. So features which have raised difficulties in the Biblical royal Psalms (like the world-empire and the priestly position of the king) are directly attested in foreign cultures, and so are to be understood as certified for Israel. If this comparison be systematically undertaken, it will certainly be of very great significance for the illumination of the Psalms, and will certainly also have to be considered in their dating. Even now, for instance, the view that Biblical Psalm composition arose first in the exile, whilst that of other lands flourished thousands of years earlier, sounds extraordinarily improbable.

5. In conclusion, a brief word may be said about the *terminus ad quem of the Psalms*. As we have seen, *Psalm-composition* never actually came to an end on Biblical ground, but continued its course far beyond the Old Testament Canon. But there is another question: *at what point were the last of the Biblical Psalms written?* A favourite theory to-day indicates the *Maccabean* period as the *terminus ad quem*. Now we possess poems which certainly come from this period—namely, the "Psalms of Solomon." We should have expected that scholars who hold many, or even some, Psalms to be Maccabean, would have studied these "Psalms of Solomon" with the greatest earnestness, and have compared them carefully with the former. The exact opposite has been true. They have overlooked this

question altogether, or have been content to dismiss it with a few easily uttered words. Here, then, must we plough the fallow, and here, too, nothing can help us but the study of the classes. But if we really press down to the roots of the question, and seek to study both form and content, then there can be no question but that there is a deep gulf between the two: in a fashion quite strange to the Biblical Psalms, the "Psalms of Solomon" are wholly corroded by contemplation. We take as an example Ps. Sal. xv.; the Psalm is a "hymn of thanksgiving," but only follows the usual course of such Psalms in its first two sentences. It contains a short account of the disaster suffered by the poet, as is the usual custom in this class, but then follow all manner of various reflections which fill up the rest of the poem; and this is true also of nearly all the other poems. Meditation on the divine requital, and especially on theodicy, is everywhere intruded, and has transformed the whole. If we compare with them even the latest canonical poems, in which reflection does appear, though not to any great extent, we recognise that these belong to a far earlier age.

6. We have reached the end. The material is far from being exhausted by what we have been able to offer here. It is our hope that in this fleeting hour at least one fact may have been clearly apprehended—namely, that the history of the classes has placed the question of the arrangement and dating of the Psalms in a new light. But that is not all; in the study of the Psalms no question can arise on which we shall not find that the study of the classes has some contribution to offer.

H. GUNKEL.

DAS GEBET DER ANGEKLAGTEN IM ALTEN TESTAMENT.*

In dem grossen, der deuteronomischen Bearbeitung der Königsbücher angehörigen Weihegebet des Salomo spricht der König zu Jahve (I. Reg. viii. 30): "Höre auf das Flehen Deines Knechtes und Deines Volkes Israel, so oft sie an diesem Orte beten. Und wenn Du es hörst . . . so tue, was sie bitten und sei gnädig." Im folgenden werden dann die Gebete, die Jahve erfüllen soll, wenn sie im Tempel gesprochen werden, im einzelnen aufgezählt: Vv. 33-37 sprechen von den grossen öffentlichen Bussgebeten, zu denen sich das Volk in seiner Gesamtheit im Tempel einfindet, und nennen die besonderen Anlässe—die Plagen und Nöte—bei denen solche Bussfeiern stattfinden.

Vv. 31 und 32 aber stellen dem voran einen Anlass, aus dem ein Einzelner zum Gebet in den Tempel kommt: da heisst es:

"Wenn sich jemand gegen einen seiner Volksgenossen versündigt hat, und jener legt ihm einen Eid auf und lässt ihn schwören, und der nimmt vor Deinem Altar in diesem Hause den Eid auf sich, Du aber hörst das im Himmel; dann handle und richte Deine Knechte, indem Du den Schuldigen für schuldig erklärst und seinen Wandel auf sein Haupt kommen lässt, den Gerechten aber für gerecht erklärst und ihm gibst entsprechend seiner Gerechtigkeit."

Der Vorgang, von dem hier ist die Rede, wird in diesen Worten sehr anschaulich: es handelt sich um einen Streit zwischen zwei Israeliten. Dem einen ist ein Unrecht widerfahren, und er gibt die Schuld daran einem andern. Dieser

*Der Vortrag erscheint erweitert und durch Anmerkungen erläutert als Beiheft der ZAW.

andere—das wird nicht ausgesprochen, ist aber die Voraussetzung des Ganzen—gesteht diese Schuld nicht ein. Nun legt ihm der Geschädigte auf, einen Eid (eine Selbstverwünschung) vor dem Altar Jahves im Tempel auf sich zu nehmen. Es wird erwartet, dass Jahve darauf einschreitet, dass er etwas—leider hören wir nicht, was—tun wird, woraus man deutlich erkennt, ob der Betreffende "schuldig," ein *rascha'*, oder ob er " unschuldig," ein *ṣaddik*, ist.

Wir sehen also, dass der Tempel die Stätte eines *Gerichtsverfahrens*, genauer, eines *Untersuchungsverfahrens* ist. Natürlich muss es sich dabei um eine Art von Gottesgericht gehandelt haben : Jahve ist es, der den Angeklagten als Frevler brandmarkt oder seine Unschuld an den Tag bringt. Da der Anfang eine Aufzählung von Gebeten bildet, die im Tempel gesprochen werden sollen, muss auch bei ihm wohl ein *Gebet* gesprochen worden sein. Als Betenden kann man sich denken etwa den Priester, der die Eidesabgabe und das Gottesgericht vorbereitet und überwacht, oder den Kläger oder den Angeklagten. Genaueres ist hier nicht zu ersehen.

Man wird annehmen dürfen, dass eine Anrufung der Gottheit aus diesem Anlass recht häufig gewesen ist ; wie könnte sie sonst in dieser Aufzählung voranstehen, wie könnte sie sonst das einzige Gebet eines Einzelnen im Tempel sein, das hier überhaupt erwähnt wird.

In der Tat hören wir nun auch sonst von einem Verfahren im Heiligtum, das man unternimmt, um in einer Strafsache zur Klarheit über Schuld oder Unschuld zu kommen. Ich möchte—von anderem absehend—nur hinweisen auf Deut. xvii. 8. Da heisst es : " Wenn Dir ein Rechtshandeln zu schwierig erscheint in Sachen eines Mordes, einer Eigentumsfrage, einer Misshandlung, überhaupt irgendwelcher Prozessangelegenheiten in einer deiner Ortschaften, dann mache Dich auf, wandere hinauf zu dem Ort, den Jahve, Dein Gott, sich erwählt, und bringe es vor die levitischen Priester und frage sie ; sie werden Dir dann den Rechtsspruch kundtun.

Auch hier handelt es sich ja offenbar um ein Untersuchungsverfahren. Fragt man, wie die Priester zu dem Rechtsspruch, den sie zu fällen haben, gelangen, so wird

man auch hier an ein Gottesgericht oder etwas ähnliches zu denken haben ; denn die Fähigkeit, sonst unlösbare Dinge herauszubringen, wird ja als an der besonderen Heiligkeit des Ortes haftend angesehen. Daraus ergibt sich von selbst die überrationale Methode der Entscheidung.

Eine Anschauung von solchem Untersuchungsverfahren gewinnen wir aus Num. v. 11 ff., dem Verfahren gegen eine des Ehebruchs verdächtige Frau. Alles was uns hier berichtet wird, passt zu den Angaben von I. Reg. viii. : Ein Geschädigte (in diesem Falle der Ehemann) erhebt Klage. Die Beschuldigte, aber ihre Schuld Leugnende (die Ehefrau), wird in den Tempel geführt. Dort muss sie die eidliche Versicherung ihrer Unschuld unter ganz besonderen begleitenden Handlungen auf sich nehmen. Darauf wird ein Opfer dargebracht, und nun muss die Frau aus einem Becher trinken, dessen Inhalt der Priester vorher gemischt hat. Und je nachdem ihr dieser Trunk bekommt, wird ihre Schuld oder Unschuld offenbart. Das ist ein Gottesgericht in ausgesprochener Form.

Vergleichen lässt sich auch Deut. xxi., wo das Ermittlungsverfahren in Sachen eines Mordes beschrieben wird. Ein weiteres Beispiel einer solchen Anrufung des Gottes zur Herausstellung von Schuld und Unschuld findet sich in einer der aramäischen Papyruskunden von Elephantine (Sachau Leipzig 1911, Papyrus 27) :—

" Am 18 des Paophi im Jahre 4 des Königs Artaxerxes in Jeb, der Festung, sprach Malkijah, der Sohn des Josehibja, ein Aramäer, begütert in der Festung Jeb (gehörig) zum Fähnlein des Nebo Kudurri zu . . . einem Aramäer, gehörig zum Fähnlein des . . . mit Gewalt (?) und hast gestossen meine Frau und hast mit Gewalt (?) Geld fortgenommen aus meinem Hause und hast es Dir angeeignet. Ich habe gemacht Bitte und Anrufung hin zu unserm Gott. Er (Gott) hat mir seine Entscheidung gegeben : Ich Malkija lasse Dich aussprechen vor Haram-Bethel, dem Gotte, zwischen vier Rächern (?) also : " Nicht habe ich Dein Haus mit Gewalt (betreten), und Deine Frau habe ich nicht gestossen, und Geld habe ich nicht mit Gewalt aus Deinem Hause fortgenommen ; und wenn ich Dich gerufen habe vor diesen Rächern . . . auch (ich rufe)."

Hier erhebt ein Geschädigter (Malkija) gegen einen andern Klage. Sie lautet auf Hausfriedensbruch, Körperverlastung (oder tätliche Beleidigung) und Raub. Der Beschuldigte ist nicht geständig. Man muss wohl annehmen, dass die Strafhandlung in dunkler Nacht erfolgt und die Feststellung der Persönlichkeit daher nicht ohne weiteres unbestreitbar sicher ist. Was geschieht nun? Malkijah begibt sich zunächst in den Tempel und betet, dass der Gott sich der Sache annehmen und die Schuld ans Licht bringen möge. Auf dieses Gebet wird ihm die Entscheidung, dass er den Verdächtigen "vor dem Gott Haram-Bethel," also im Heiligtum (ganz entsprechend dem "vor Deinem Altar in diesem Hause," I. Reg. viii. 31) einen Eid schwören lassen soll. Dabei sollen vier Zeugen zugegen sein. Ihre Bezeichnung als "Rächer"—wofern das Wort von Sachau richtig verstanden worden ist—scheint ihnen Recht und Pflicht des Vollzuges der Strafe für den Fall, dass der Angeklagte schuldig ist, oder wenigstens seine Auslieferung an das bürgerliche Gericht aufzuerlegen.

Ob diese Schuld sich (wie Num. v. 11) sofort durch ein Gottesurteil herausstellt, ist auch in diesem Falle nicht deutlich. Man möchte es aber doch annehmen; denn handelt es sich etwa um die Ablegung des Eides lediglich in der Erwartung, dass die Gottheit den Meineid früher oder später rächen werde, so wäre die Bezeichnung "Rächer" für die Zeugen nicht zu erklären. Diese versteht sich nur, wenn die Männer gewissermassen als Henker bereitstehen, um den vom Gottesurteil Gebrandmarkten sofort zu richten oder seinem Gericht zuzuführen.

Das Schriftstück ist eine schriftliche Vorladung vor das Gottesgericht. Auch hier gewinnt man den Eindruck, dass ein solches Verfahren der Untersuchung üblich und daher häufig gewesen ist. In Elephantine hat sich mancherlei vom alten religiösen Volksgebrauch Israels erhalten. Wir sind wohl berechtigt, das Dokument unmittelbar neben I. Reg. viii. 30, womit es sich so eng berührt, zu stellen.

Die so gewonnene Anschauung scheint mir nun auf eine nicht geringe Anzahl von Psalmen ein helles Licht zu werfen. Es ist ja von vornherein naheliegend, dass—

ebenso wie die öffentlichen Klage- und Bussgebete, auf die I. Reg. viii. 33-37 hinweisen, uns in Anzahl im Psalter erhalten sind—so auch der Hinweis auf Gebete eines Einzelnen aus Anlass eines Untersuchungsverfahrens im Tempel durch Beispiele aus dem Psalter wird beleuchtet werden können. Dabei ist noch immer die Frage offen, an wen wir als den Betenden I. Reg. viii. 30 ff. zu denken haben, ob an den amtierenden Priester, an den Kläger oder an den Angeklagten.

Hier kann uns zunächst Ps. cvii. einen Anhalt zu einer Antwort geben, die grosse Liturgie für die Darbringung der Todah, des Gelübdeopfers, zu der an einem bestimmten Tage des Herbstfestes alle im Tempel zusammenzukommen pflegten, die seit dem letzten Herbst in irgend einer drängenden Not Gott ein Gelübde getan und seine Hülfe erfahren hatten.

Deutlich scheinen diese " Erlösten Jahves, die er erlöst hat aus Faust der Not " in dieser Liturgie nach Gruppen geordnet, je nach der Art der Not, in der sie " zu Jahve geschrieen " haben. Es werden aufgezählt :

> solche, die in Gefahren auf der Wüstenreise,
> solche, die in schwerer Krankeit,
> solche, die bei einer Seefahrt

von Jahve erhört worden sind. Dazwischen werden nun als zweite Gruppe (v. 10) genannt :

> solche, die " gefangen in Elend und Eisen," " in tiefer Finsternis " gesessen haben.

In dieser harten Lage sind sie gewesen, weil sie sich gegen die Gebote Gottes widerspenstig verhalten, den Willen des Höchsten missachtet haben.

Was für eine Not mit diesen Worten gemeint ist, zeigt mit aller Klarheit die Beschreibung ihrer Errettung : " Er hat zerbrochen eherne Türen, hat eiserne Riegel zerschlagen." Es handelt sich also um in Haft Genommene, um Menschen, die wegen einer Übertretung geltender Gottesgebote angeschuldigt und deswegen eingesperrt gewesen sind.

Die also haben " zu Jahve geschrieen." Da ihr Geschick noch nicht entschieden, vielmehr noch zum Bösen oder zum Guten zu wendet ist, haben wir offenbar nicht an Verurteilte zu denken, sondern an Beschuldigte, man möchte sagen, an Untersuchungsgefangene. Es wird uns also hier ein Gebet der *Angeklagten* bezeugt. Daran haben wir auch in unserer Ausgangstelle zu denken: im Augenblick dringendster Not, wo der Angeklagte aus der Haft zum Gottesgericht in den Tempel geführt wird, da hat er—was ist natürlicher als dies—zu Jave geschrieen, dass er ihm helfen möge.

Sind uns nun solche Gebete Angeklagter erhalten? Ich glaube in auffallend grosser Zahl. Ich greife, aus Rücksicht auf die Zeit, einen einzigen heraus, Ps. vii.:

2. Jahve, mein Gott, bei Dir suche ich Zuflucht,
   Hilf mir vor dem, der mir nachstellt, und rette mich,
3. Dass er nicht wie ein Löwe meine Gurgel zerreisst,
   Nicht davon trägt und niemand ist, der errettet!
4. Jahve, mein Gott, wenn ich *dies* getan habe,
   Wenn wirklich unrechtes Gut in meinen Händen ist,
5. Wenn ich meinem Genossen Böses angetan,
   Wenn ich bestohlen den, der mich ohne Grund
   befehdet,
6. Dann mag der Feind meine Seele hetzen und einholen,
   Dann soll er mein Leben am Boden zertreten,
   Dann soll er meine Ehre in den Schmutz werfen!

Hier haben wir unverkennbar einen Schwur, die Selbstverwünschung eines Beschuldigten. Das zurückweisende " dies " setzt voraus, dass zuvor eine Anklage, eine Beschuldigung gegen den Betenden ausgesprochen worden ist. Diese Anklage wird hier nicht wörtlich zitiert. Inhaltlich aber wird sie uns deutlich gezeichnet: Es handelt sich um ein *Eigentumsvergehen*, um einen *Diebstahl*, und zwar begangen an einem Volks- oder Sippengenossen, also unter Missbrauch eines Vertrauensverhältnisses. So jedenfalls hat es die Anklage ausgesprochen. Der Beschuldigte aber hat den Eid auf sich genommen. Angesichts seines Gottes

verflucht er sich für den Fall, dass der andere recht hat mit seiner Beschuldigung.

Dieser Selbstverwünschung folgt nun v. 7 das eigentliche "Gebet des Angeklagten":

> Erhebe Dich, Jahve, in Deinem Zorn,
> Steh auf im Grimm wider meine Feinde!
> Erwache mein Gott, das Gericht zu entbieten!
> Die Versammlung der Himmlischen schare sich um Dich:
> Setze Dich über sie in der Höhe!
> Schaffe mir Recht, Jahve, nach meiner Gerechtigkeit,
> Nach der Makellosigkeit, wie sie mein eigen!

Wir tun hier einen Blick in die Vorstellungswelt, die sich mit einem solchen Gottesgericht verbindet: Obwohl es sich um einen einzelnen Menschen, ja, um einen einzelnen Diebstahl handelt, denkt sich der Betende, dass Jahve die Himmlischen dazu entbietet. In einer Versammlung, ähnlich der, wie sie nach der Rahmenerzählung des Buches Hiob an bestimmten Tagen immer wieder stattfindet, stellt Jahve die Unschuld des Angeklagten fest. Die dabei ursprünglich zugrunde liegende Vorstellung ist, dass er seiner dienender Organe bedarf, um genau zu wissen, was auf Erde vorgeht.

Wenn man so den "Sitz im Leben," den ein solches Gebet hat, erkannt hat, ist man nicht mehr in Versuchung in Ps. cxlii., die Bitte "Führe mich aus dem Kerker heraus, damit ich Deinem Namen danken kann" als ein Bild für Angst und Not oder gar für das Exil zu verstehen. Man nimmt Ps. xxxi. 9 "Du hast meine Füsse treten lassen!" wörtlich. Und in Ps. xxvi., der beginnt "Schaffe mir Recht, Jahve, denn mein Wandel ist makellos," in dem v. 9 heisst:

> Raffe nicht mit den Sündern meine Seele dahin,
> Mit den Mordgesellen mein Leben;
> An deren Händen Schandtat klebt"

erkennt man wohl mit Gunkel, dass der Betende "Offenbar Grund hat sich vor einem plötzlichen Tode zu fürchten,"

aber man wird ihm schwerlich recht geben, wenn er fortfährt: "Wir dürfen also auch hier wie bei so vielen Gebeten dieser Gattung an eine schwere Krankheit denken." Von einer Krankheit verlautet hier doch schlechthin nichts!

Dagegen heisst es: Ich wasche meine Hände in Unschuld." Das Waschen der Hände am heiligen Ort ist die feierliche Abwehr eines Verdachtes, die feierliche Erklärung der Schuldlosigkeit in einem Untersuchungsverfahren. Der prägnante Ausdruck "in Unschuld" statt "in Wasser zum Beweise meiner Unschuld" zeigt völlig unausweichlich was es mit diesem Kultusakt ursprünglich für eine Bewandtnis hat.

Demnach besteht die Todesgefahr dieses Mannes darin, dass er *beschuldigt* worden ist. Sein Gebet ist die Beteuerung, der Schwur, wie ihn I. Reg. viii. 31 voraussetzt.

Ps. xxvii. 7-14, werden die Feinde des Betenden "Verleumder" und "Lügenzeugen" genannt. Hier zeugen die gewählten Ausdrücke so eindeutig von der Lage, in der sich der Klagende befindet, dass sich sowohl Kittel als Bertholet, obwohl sie ihre Betrachtung dieser Gebete im allgemeinen in eine andere Richtung weist, hier unwiderstehlich auf den Weg geführt sehen, den unsere Untersuchung gegangen ist: "Ein von Feinden (11 f.), wie es scheint, vor Gericht Schwerbedrängter ruft Gottes Hilfe an. Man will ihn vernichten, vielleicht hinrichten (12b), und falsche Zeugen sind bereit, dazu zu helfen." So heisst es bei Kittel, S. 113. Und Bertholet (bei Kautzsch, 4. Aufl. S. 149) sagt: "In höchster Lebensnot—es handelt sich, da Vers 1a Zeugen gennant sind, um einen Prozess auf Leben und Tod—erhebt ein von aller Welt, selbst seinen Nächsten Verlassener seinen beweglichen Hilferuf an Gott.

Den bisher erwähnten Psalmen könnte man als gleichartig an die Seite stellen die Psalmen iv., vii., xi., xiii., xvii., xxv., xxviii., xxxviii., xxxix., lii., liv., lv., lvi., lvii., lviii., lix., lxxvii., lxxxvi., lxxxviii., xciv., cii., cxxxix., und Hab. i. 1-5. In ihnen allen scheinen mir, das ist nun zusammenfassend zu sagen, die Feinde, vor denen sich der Betende fürchtet, Menschen zu sein, die ihn vor Gericht verdächtigt

oder verklagt haben. In keinem dieser Gebete lässt sich der Beweis führen, dass der Betende krank und durch seine Krankeit in Todesgefahr gewesen sei.

Nun ist aber andererseits nicht zu leugnen, dass auch eine Anzahl offensichtlich von Kranken gesprochener Gebete vorliegen, in denen in fast den gleichen Ausdrücken wie in den besprochenen und aufgezählten von " Feinden " des Psalmisten die Rede ist : Ich erinnere etwa an Psalm xxxviii. Der Betende klagt :

4. Nichts ist gesund an meinem Fleisch,
   Weil Du mir zürnst,
   Nichts ist heil an meinen Gebeinen
   Wegen meiner Sünde.

6. Es stinken, es eitern meine Wunden
   Um meine Torheit willen.
   Ich bin gebeugt, gekrümmt—
   Ach, wie sehr !
   In meinen Lenden ist der Brand ;
   Nichts ist gesund an meinem Fleisch.

Weiter ist die Rede von stürmischem Herzklopfen und versagendem Augenlicht. Es kann hier gar keinem Zweifel unterliegen, dass wir die Worte eines Kranken vor uns haben. Zugleich aber fühlt sich nun dieser Mann von Feinden umgeben :

12. Meine Lieben und meine Freunde stehen abseits,
    Weil ich von Gott geschlagen bin ;
    Meine Verwandten halten sich fern von mir !

13. Und Schlingen legen, die mir nach dem Leben trachten,
    Die mein Unheil suchen, reden Frevel.
    Den ganzen Tag zischeln sie Lügen.

20. Die mich ohne Ursache befehden, sind zahlreich,
    Viele sind es, die mich grundlos hassen,

21. Die mir Gutes mit Bösem vergelten,
    Mich verklagen, wo ich dem Guten nachging !

Dies Nebeneinander der Klage über Krankheitsnot und über Feinde, die den Kranken verhöhnen, die aber nicht nur mit Schadenfreude von seinem baldigen Sterben reden, sondern die darauf aus sind, ihm den Tod zu geben, finden wir, soviel ich sehe, in allen Krankheitspsalmen (ich erinnere nur an die Psalmen vi., xxii.). Welch eine seltsame Erscheinung! In einem Augenblick, in dem man voraussetzen möchte, dass ein Mensch von lauter Mitleid umgeben und aller lieben Hülfe teilhaftig ist, finden wir diese Schwerkranken in grenzenloser Vereinsamung und herzbewegender Angst.

Mowinckel hat versucht, das Problem das sich hier auftut, durch die Vermutung zu lösen, dass es sich hier überall um Zauberer handle, die die Krankheit hervorgerufen hätten. Nun unterliegt es keinem Zweifel, dass der Gedanke an Zauber und schwarze Kunst dem israelitischen Beter wie dem antiken Menschen überhaupt nahe liegt. Um so auffallender ist, dass die "Feinde," soviel ich sehe, nirgends von einem kranken Betenden für die Entstehung der Krankheit verantwortlich gemacht werden. Diese Feinde sind unter den Nöten der Leidenden nicht das Erste, sondern das Zweite. Die Ursache der Krankheit liegt nicht bei den Menschen, sondern bei Gott. Ueberall ist Jahve der Urheber des Leidens, und die Feinde treten erst auf, nachdem der Betreffende krank geworden ist.

"Der Grund liegt"—ich kann hier wörtlich wiederholen, was ich bereits 1912 in meiner Schrift "Die religiöse Lyrik im Alten Testament"[1] gesagt habe—"in einer Anschauung, die einer der Grundpfeiler der alttestamentlichen Frömmigkeit ist, in der Anschauung, dass alles Leid Strafe für die Sünde des Menschen ist. So musste man in jeder schweren Krankheit den Beweis einer Schuld sehen. War einer in Fieber gefallen, waren etwa gar die Schrecken des Aussatzes an ihm bemerkbar geworden, so steckten die Nachbarn die Köpfe zusammen und ratschlagten, was er wohl getan habe.

Und wehe, wenn dann gerade irgendeine Untat geschehen ist, deren Täter man nicht kennt, etwa ein Mord oder ein Diebstahl! Der Kranke muss es gewesen sein, Gott selbst

[1] Tübingen, bei J. C. B. Mohr.

hat es ja kund gemacht. Oft mag so eine Krankheit zum ersten Anlass einer Anklage geworden sein. Es ist kein Wunder, dass die Klagegebete der Angeklagten und die der Kranken einander so ähnlich sind. Mancher war in der furchtbaren Anlage, beides in einer Person zu sein.

Ein einziges Beispiel für diese besondere Art der Gebete Angeklagter, deren Beter zugleich krank sind, mag genannt sein :

PSALM lxix.

2. Hilf mir, Gott, denn schon steigt mir
Das Wasser bis an den Hals !

3. Ich versinke im Schlamm der Tiefe,
Und ist noch kein Grund.
Bin geraten in Wasserstrudel
Und der Strom reisst mich fort.

---

4. Ich habe mich müde geschrieen,
Heiser ist meine Kehle,
Meine Augen vergehen
Vom Harren auf meinen Gott !

5. Mehr als Haare auf meinem Haupt
Sind, die mich ohne Grund hassen.
Stark sind, die mich vernichten wollen,
Mich voll Trug anfeinden.
Was ich nicht gestohlen habe,
Das soll ich zurückgeben !

6. Gott, Du allein kennst meine Verfehlung,
Und meine Verschuldungen sind Dir nicht verborgen.

Klarer, als es hier geschieht kann die Not, in der sich der Betende befindet, kaum beschrieben werden : Er ist beschuldigt worden, einen Diebstahl begangen zu haben. Man fordert von ihm, dass er etwas herausgeben soll, was er nicht genommen hat. Der Angstruf " erlöse meine Seele,"

" befreie mich " (Vers 19) ist nicht anders zu verstehen, als wir ihn bisher verstanden haben. Die Todesangst, im Schlamme zu versinken, vom Strome fortgerissen zu werden, in der der Betende sich schon als ein Opfer des Totenreiches fühlt, hat ihren Grund darin, dass ihm das Messer eines Verdachtes, der zur Todesstrafe führen kann, an der Kehle sitzt.

Zugleich ist der Betende offenbar krank :

27. Den Du geschlagen hast, verfolgen sie,
Dem, den Du misshandelt, mehren sie den Schmerz.

30. Ich bin elend und leidend.

Und obwohl dies nicht ausdrücklich gesagt wird, müssen wir annehmen, dass sich die Verkläger eben auf diese Krankheit bezogen in ihr das Gotteszeichen seiner Schuld gefunden haben. Wenn er unmittelbar nach der Klage : " Was ich nicht gestohlen habe, soll ich wiedergeben," fortfährt :

6. Jahve, Du allein kennst meine Verfehlung,
Vor Dir ist nicht verborgen, womit ich mich verschuldet habe.

so wehren diese Sätze doch offenbar die Meinung ab, dass die Schuld, durch die sein Schicksal veranlasst worden ist, eben die von seinen Feinden behauptete sei. Gewiss, eine Schuld muss wohl vorliegen ; sonst wäre er ja nicht krank, aber nur Gott weiss, was für eine ! Jedenfalls, der Diebstahl, wegen dessen die anderen mit Fingern auf ihn weisen, ist es nicht.

Wenn wir zurückschauen, so wird uns ein Unterschied in den von uns vorgeführten Gebeten klar. Die zuerst besprochenen sind sämtlich erfüllt von Versicherungen der Unschuld und Makellosigkeit des Betenden. Es sind die von Gunkel so genannten " Unschuldspsalmen." Anders die zuletzt erwähnten, in denen der Angeklagte zugleich krank ist. In diesen Fällen versichert er zwar auch, nicht getan zu haben, wessen er bezichtigt wird, aber stellt nicht in Abrede dass irgend welche andere Schuld ihn drückt.

Auch für ihn ist der Gottesschlag, unter dem er seufzt, ist seine Krankheit ein voll ausreichender Beweis eines strafwürdigen Verhaltens. Er wehrt sich nur dagegen, dass sie zu einem bestimmten Vorgang in Beziehung gesetzt, dass sie zur Ursache einer ganz besonderen Bezichtigung genommen wird.

HANS SCHMIDT.

ISRAEL AND ITS RELIGIOUS ENVIRONMENT.

The question of the effect which Israel's contact with her neighbours had upon the religion of the Hebrews is one which has received a good deal of attention within the last few decades. It is clearly recognized that not only are there numerous *traits* in the religion of Israel which prove that it was developed from beliefs originally common to all Semites, but also that in some important particulars the *developed* religion of Israel shows affinity with the religious thought and practice of other ancient oriental peoples. On the other hand, everyone must acknowledge that there is in the religion of Israel something which is absolutely unique; conceptions are held regarding the Deity which are immeasurably superior to those of other peoples; and ideals of the loftiest kind are inculcated which point to Israel's teachers as standing on a higher level than those of any other ancient nation.

The result has been that, on the one hand, the religion of Israel is regarded by some as simply and solely the result of an evolutionary process; while, on the other hand, others believe with equal certainty that it is the outcome of a special revelation. The cleft between these two positions is very disconcerting; indeed, it is apparently an unbridgeable chasm; and each position is so strongly fortified that, at any rate at present, there can be no question of capitulation on the part of either defender.

Personally, I have not the slightest doubt about what the ultimate outcome will be, because I do not see how, men being what they are, and being constituted as they are, religion can be other than evolutionary; on the other

hand, the very words "evolutionary" and "religion" involve belief in revelation; because evolution, whether of thought or substance, is the unfolding of something antecedent, and when you have reached rock-bottom the antecedent germ eludes human observation, so that one must assume something extra-human to account for the facts, and there is no alternative other than that of a "divine germ," which is only another name for revelation. So, too, with the word "religion"; in whatever way one may define it, if it does not postulate someone superhuman, or believed to be so, it is meaningless. However, that is by the way, being merely a personal conviction. The problem is very real, and full of difficulties; and for the present there can be no doubt that it is incumbent upon us all to examine the ever-increasing material owing to the existence of which the problem has arisen, and to bring forward facts, whichever of the two positions they seem to support, be the facts small or great, important or apparently insignificant.

Everybody recognizes that external religious and cultural influences affected Israel's thinkers, and, therefore, the religion of Israel; but it is doubtful how far the other side of the picture finds favour—namely, the possibility of Israel's thinkers affecting with their religious ideas the thinkers of the surrounding nations. The first natural impulse is to regard this latter as improbable; Israel was so insignificant in the big world of its surroundings that the idea of its seeking to influence in any way its great neighbours is scorned. Nevertheless, this possibility ought not to be dismissed as unworthy of consideration; and especially as to whether any monotheistic tendencies which may be observed outside Israel may have owed their origin to Israel. *Thoughts* are what really rule the world, and it is of small consequence who first originates them provided they are disseminated; a small, politically insignificant nation may be as capable of producing great thinkers as one of far-stretching and outstanding importance; so that Israel's insignificance is no bar to the possibility of her having influenced thinkers of other nations. True, the material for estimating this at present is small, and it

must be acknowledged that most of it supports the thesis of Israel being affected by the religion of others; but material in support of the other contention is not wholly wanting.

The most recent and, in some respects, the most important document bearing on the subject illustrates, I believe there is reason to think, indebtedness on the part of both Israel and Egypt to each other; I mean, of course, *The Teaching of Amen-em-ope*. To the scholars who have written on this interesting work deep thanks are due; and, from the Old Testament point of view, above all to the great scholar who endeared himself to so many of us, and who, alas, is no longer among us in body, Hugo Gressmann. It is not my intention to repeat what they have said, but I may be permitted to draw attention to two points in this Egyptian Wisdom-book which bear directly on this subject of mutual indebtedness.

(i) The first, which witnesses to Egyptian influence on Israel, arises out of a verse from the *Book of Proverbs* xvi. 11, of which the English R.V. runs:

> "A just balance and scales are Jahweh's,
> All the weights of the bag are his work."

The rendering is grammatically incorrect as in the phrase *peles ûmōzᵉnê mishpāṭ*, the last word *mishpāṭ* can only refer to *mozᵉnê;* but since it would be unnatural to restrict the word "just" to the "scales" as the Hebrew does, it is obvious that *mishpāṭ* does not belong to the original text, but was added by a scribe who did not see the point of the saying. If balance and scales are Jahweh's, it goes without saying that they are just; the question of their being just or otherwise only arises with man's use of them; but that is precisely what is *not* in question here. The whole point of the saying is that Jahweh is the Giver of balance and scales; they belong to Him and came from Him. Now that is an idea which is entirely un-Hebraic. Toy remarks with perfect justice that "as the text stands God is the ordainer of the machinery of commercial transactions, a statement which is not found elsewhere in the

Old Testament ; He is said (as in Lev. xix. 36 and elsewhere) to *demand* just weights, he is not said to make or establish them." Hence Toy and other commentators would read : " Balance and scales are the King's " (*peles ûmōzᵉnîm lammelekh*), in the sense that the system of weights and measures is ordained by the king as supreme authority and fountain of justice. It is here, however, that Amen-em-ope comes in to show that the Massoretic text as it stands is right (with the exception of the word *mishpāṭ*, which in any case goes out). For it is evident that the compiler of this collection in the *Book of Proverbs* in which this saying occurs, borrowed the idea from the Egyptian book and adapted it to his Hebrew readers. The idea, though foreign to Hebrew religious thought, was quite in accord with that of the Egyptians ; for Amen-em-ope says (xvi., xvii. 18—xviii. 3) :

" Move not the scales, and falsify not the weights,
And diminish not the parts of the corn-measure . . .
The Ape (*i.e.*, the symbol of the god Thoth) sitteth by the balance,
His heart being the plummet.
Where is a god so great as Thoth,
Who discovered these things and made them."

Ranke points out that the plummet of Egyptian balances was often made in the shape of a heart. So that we get here quite plainly the teaching that the god Thoth was the maker of scales and balances. This idea the Hebrew sage adopts, substituting, of course, the name of Jahweh for Thoth ; and this explains the otherwise unaccountable statement in a Hebrew *mashal*. But this is a *religious* idea, borrowed from an Egyptian Wisdom-writer, and adapted to Hebrew readers.

(ii) The second, which witnesses to Israelite influence on Egyptian thought, is concerned with Prov. xx. 9.

" Who can say I have made my heart clean,
I am pure from my sin ? "

The implication is, of course, that no man can do so, that no man is pure from sin. The root here (ZKH) is always used in regard to ethical purity ; the words witness to a developed sense of sin. But the form of the saying suggests that the thought of the possibility of such purity *was* entertained by some ; it almost looks as though the writer were combating some such teaching as was contained in the later doctrine of *Zakûth*, according to which when a man had satisfied all the divine demands made upon him he was in a state of purification, or justification as we should say, in the sight of God. Probably such a doctrine was not actually formulated at the time when this was written, but there is no reason to suppose that it did not exist in essence. In any case, it would have involved what for a better way of expressing it might be called a reckoning-up with God, something of the kind of thing which is spoken of in T. B. *Kiddûshin* 40^{b}, where it is said that a man is judged " according to that which balances "—*i.e.*, according as to whether the sum of his sins or of his good deeds weighs heavier. Ideas such as these would float about for centuries before they assumed definite form and authoritative approval ; and, therefore, it is quite possible that something of the kind existed when the Wisdom writer penned these words in opposition.

Now we have in the *Teaching of Amen-em-ope* a very interesting parallel to this *Proverbs* passage, viz. :—

> " Say not, ' I have no sin,'
> And be not at pains to seek strife (?) ;
> Sin belongeth to God,
> It is sealed with His finger " (xviii., xix. 18-21).

The second line offers some difficulty to Egyptologists ; Ranke translates it : " Bemühe dich nicht Streit zu suchen," so too Griffith, which Erman explains as meaning " mit Gott zu hadern." Lange renders it : " Bemühe dich nicht zu versuchen an ihn (Gott) heranzukommen." The context seems to justify the opinion that the line means that a man must not seek to justify himself in the sight of God ; " striving with God " on the matter of sins is most naturally

understood as referring to self-justification. And this is further borne out by the words which follow :

> " There is no excellence with God (*i.e.*, in the sight of God, referring to what man conceives to be his own excellence),
> And there is nothing lacking with Him (*i.e.*, God)."

So that it will be acknowledged that we have here what is, in essence, identity of thought between the Hebrew and Egyptian Sages. And the question arises as to whether there is indebtedness here on the part of one to the other. For reasons which can only be alluded to, but not worked out in a short paper like this, I contend that it is not impossible that we have here a case of indebtedness on the part of the Egyptian sage to the Hebrew writer of the *Proverbs* couplet.

Even in pre-exilic times the idea of Jahweh's interest in other nations is brought out in some of the quite early sources ; this subject is dealt with in Martin Peisker's *Die Beziehungen der Nichtisraeliten zu Jahve nach der Anschauung der altisraelitischen Quellenschriften.* And the prophets embrace non-Israelite nations in their religious outlook, and contemplate the possibility of other nations acknowledging Israel's God. It is hardly conceivable, in view of the idea of a world-religion such as this latter implied, that opportunities would not have been seized of proclaiming Jahweh's name and attributes among non-Israelites. And if this is conceded it must be regarded as something more than a possibility that Israel's exalted religious ideas should have appealed to some of the higher thinkers outside Israel. As an illustration of this there is some justification in referring to the Egyptian Wisdom-book from which the quoted passages have been taken ; the uniqueness of this work in Egyptian literature centres just in those things which are specifically Israelite : religious and ethical conceptions and teaching, and, above all, its monotheistic tendency. It can hardly be regarded as fanciful to see the reflection of Hebrew thought in the writing of Amen-em-ope. Cultural relationships, and,

therefore, more frequent opportunities for the exercise of mutual influence, would be more likely to exist between Egypt and Israel on account of the geographical position, quite apart from other reasons, than between Israel and Assyria or Babylonia.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

THE SYNTAX AND MEANING OF GENESIS i. 1-3.

The words of Genesis i. 1-3 are presumably familiar to the veriest tyro in the study of Hebrew :

bᵉrêshîth bārā' ᵉlōhîm 'eth hashshāmáyim wᵉ'eth hā'ārec wᵉhā'ārec hāyᵉthāh tōhû wābōhû wᵉḥōshek 'al pᵉnê tᵉhôm wᵛrûaḥ ᵉlōhîm mᵉraḥéptheth 'al pᵉnê hammáyim wayyômer ᵉlōhîm yᵉhî 'ôr wayᵉhî 'ôr.

The translation of them in the King James version is even more familiar to a much larger number of people :

1. In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.
2. And the earth was without form, and void ; and the darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.
3. And God said, " Let there be light," and there was light.

The fact that in both Hebrew and English this text has been broken up into three separate verses has helped greatly to obscure its character and meaning from the eyes of modern readers. It is the purpose of this paper to try to show that instead of there being four sentences in these three verses, as in the standard translation, there is but one.

Even the student beginning his study of Hebrew is puzzled by the fact that we find here *bᵉrêshîth* and not *bārêshîth*.[1] The easy explanation of this difficulty lies in the fact that *rêshîth* here stands in the construct relation with the following clause. Examples of this relationship

[1] Field's Hexapla cites an old transcription reading *Barēsēth*, and Lagarde's *Ankündungen*, p. 5, gives Barēseth).

and construction are not wanting. In II. Samuel xxii. 1 (Ps. xviii. 1) we read, *wayᶜdabbēr dāwīd lᶜyahweh 'eth-dibhrê hashshîrâ hazzôth bᵉyôm hiccîl yahweh 'ôthô mikkaph kol-'ōyᵉbhāw.* That is, "And David spoke to Yahweh the words of this song in the day when Yahweh rescued him from the hands of all his foes, etc." Here *yôm* is in the construct relation with the following clause starting with *hiccîl.* Again in Exod. vi. 28 we read, *wayᶜhî bᶜyôm dibber yahweh 'el-mōshé wᵉgô—i.e.,* "it came to pass that in the day when Yahweh spoke to Moses in the land of Egypt then Yahweh said, etc."

Here again the construction is identically the same. The same usage of *yôm* followed by a finite verb is found in Jer. xxxvi. 2: *miyyôm dibbartî,* "from the day when I spoke unto you"; in Ps. cii. 3, *bᶜyôm 'ekrā,* "in the day when I called"; and in Zech. viii. 9, *bᶜyôm yussadh bêth-yahweh,* "in the day when the foundation of the house of Yahweh was laid." Other expressions of time are found in the same sort of construct relationship with sentences or clauses. For example, Ps. iv. 8, *mē'ēth dᶜgānām wᶜthîrôshām rābbû,* "more than in the time when their corn and their new wine increased," where the expression *mē'ēth* has to carry a heavy load. In Isa. xv. 1 we read in the M.T. *kî bᵉlêl shuddadh 'ar mô'ābh nidhmâ,* and this is repeated in the second line with the change of but one word, *kî bᵉlêl shuddadh kîr mô'ābh nidhmâ.* This text may be corrupt in its present state; but as it stands *lêl* must be taken in the construct relationship with *shuddadh,* etc. The only possible meaning then is this, "In the night when Ar of Moab is destroyed, ruined; in the night when Kir of Moab is destroyed, ruined, then Bayith and Dibon will go up to the heights to weep, etc." The last example of this construction which we can now cite is furnished by Hosea i. 2: *tᵉḥillath dibber yahweh bᵉhôshēaʿ wayyômer yahweh wᵉgô,* "At the beginning when Yahweh spoke through Hosea then Yahweh said to Hosea, etc." This case is of especial value for our purpose, since the construction of this sentence is in principle exactly the same as that of Gen. i. 1-3. The opening words *tᵉḥillath dibber* are a duplicate of *bᵉrêshîth bārā',* and the main verb of the sentence is

wayyômer, an imperfect with waw conversive, which happens to be the very word and construction found in Gen. i. 3, where our sentence finds its completion.

This view has been held by some scholars—*e.g.*, Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Ewald, Dillmann, Holzinger, and Skinner. But since Wellhausen, *Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 185, n. 1, it has been quite generally passed over in favour of the treatment of v. 1 as a complete sentence; so, *e.g.*, Wellhausen, Gunkel, Procksch, Mitchell, Ryle, *et al.*, following Calvin and all the versions. The facts in support of the conventional view are (1) the stray transliterations cited by Field and Lagarde, (2) the negative consideration that "*rêshîth* never carries the article in any case, cf. *mērêshîth* "from the beginning" in Isa. xlvi. 10. Incidentally, these two arguments neutralise one another!

In all of these cases it may be noted that the construct is made definite by the clause depending upon it and defining it. So we may, without fear, translate Gen. i. 1, "In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth." [1]

It is noticeable that this verse does not continue with the construction that would normally be expected if it were but a continuation of the action described in verse 1. Then we should have had *watt^{e}hî hā'ārec w^{e}gô.* But instead we have *w^{e}hā'ārec hāy^{e}thâ.* This in reality gives us a nominal clause of circumstantial force, the kind of construction which is called a *hal* clause by Arabic grammarians; see Gesenius-Kautzsch, s. 141 i.[2] The verb *hāy^{e}thâ* is here used simply to locate the circumstance or fact in its proper state or condition. This is the condition or state in which the earth was when God began his creative activity. We should, therefore, translate thus far, "In the beginning, when God created the heavens and the earth, the earth having been a desolate chaos." I use this participial construction here simply to make quite clear what the thought and structure of the passage is. It may be noted that this treatment disposes completely of the objection that "the earth" and "the heavens" could not properly

[1] *Cf.* also Ps. iv. 8; xc. 15; and Gesenius-Kautzsch, s. 130*d*.
[2] *Cf.* Wright, *Arabic Grammar*, 3rd ed., ss. 182, 183.

be called "chaos," since creation put an end to chaos. This rendering brings out the fact that the "heavens and the earth" had formerly been "chaos," but were so no longer. The circumstantial clause structure continues right through the verse.

That the word *rûaḥ* should be taken here in the sense of "wind" [1] rather than in the generally accepted one of "spirit" seems required by the nature of the situation, by the affinities of this story with the Babylonian story of creation, and by the force of the participle *mᵉraḥépheth*. I can treat this matter concisely here, and refer you for fuller presentation of the evidence to earlier presentations and to an article in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature* by Professor Waterman. In the Babylonian story which influenced the Hebrew story at some stage in its development, the wind plays an important part. Marduk, the Babylonian God, in his contest with Tiamat, the equivalent of the Hebrew *tᵉhôm*, is armed with the seven winds, and great stress is laid on his use of the evil wind. In the account of his equipment for the fray the wind receives the most attention. The Hebrew story, shorn of all these polytheistic elements, has little use for the wind, and is content with this bare reference to it here. Yet in other Hebrew pictures of creation the wind plays an important part; *cf.* Job. xxvi. 12 f. The phrase *rûaḥ* ʾᵉ*lōhîm* as used here should probably be taken in the sense of "a mighty wind" or a "terrific wind," ʾᵉ*lōhîm* here being used as the equivalent of a strong superlative.[2] All winds, to be sure, were thought of as sent by God, but a *rûaḥ* ʾᵉ*lōhîm* was a "wind of God" *par excellence*. Other cases of this usage of ʾᵉ*lōhîm* and *yahweh* are found. For example, in Ps. lxviii. 16, *har* ʾᵉ*lōhîm* is in parallelism with *har gabhnunnîm*, and should be rendered:

"O mighty mountain, O Mount Bashan,
O many-peaked mountain, O Mount Bashan,

[1] So Ibn Ezra; Peters, Waterman.

[2] *Cf. e.g.*, J. P. Peters, *The Wind of God*, J. B. L., vol. xxx. (1911), pp. 44-54, and xxxiii., pp. 81-86; Prof. Waterman, A. J. S. L., 201 ff; W. F. Albright, J.B.L., xliii., 368, *contra*, who holds the curious view that the text originally read *rûaḥ*, "wind," which was later changed to *rûaḥ* ʾᵉ*lōhîm*, "Spirit of God," so as to bring God in at the beginning of the process.

Why, O many-peaked mountain, do you envy
The mountain that God has desired for his abode ? "

Here *har* *'elōhîm*, which is identified with Mt. Bashan, is clearly contrasted with Mt. Zion, which is God's chosen mountain ; hence Mt. Bashan can hardly have been thought of as " God's mountain." If Mt. Hermon was thought of here as included under the term Bashan, as is quite probable, the expression *har* *'elōhîm*, " mighty " or " lofty mountain," would be eminently appropriate.

The same idiomatic use of *'ēl* is seen in Ps. xxxvi. 6, 7, where we find the phrase *cidh'kāth'kā k'har'rê 'ēl*,

" O Yahweh, thy goodness extends to the heavens,
Thy faithfulness unto the clouds,
Thy righteousness is like the highest mountains,
Thy judgements are a great deep."

Here the whole context is stressing the figures of height and depth, and to translate literally " mountains of God " in the third line would be to lose touch completely with the figurative language. In Jon. iii. 3 we find *lē'lōhîm* used in a similar fashion ; Nineveh is there described as a city that was *g'dhôlâ lē'lōhîm*, literally, " great unto God," which can only mean " exceedingly great." It is tempting to read *b'har'rê 'ēl* in Ps. l. 10, instead of the received text *b'har'rê 'āleph*, rendering :

" For mine is every beast of the woods,
And the cattle upon the highest mountains."

However, there is no doubt that the phrase *'ar'zê 'ēl* in Ps. lxxx. 11 means " mighty " or " lofty cedars," and the phrase *kôkh'bhê 'ēl* in Isa. xiv. 13, " lofty stars." *'ēl* is more common than *'elōhîm* in this idiom ; but when once *'ēl* had established this usage for itself, it would become almost inevitable that *'elōhîm* should follow suit. An interesting parallel to this usage of *'ēl* and *'elōhîm* is furnished by the Tel-el-Amarna letters in one of which the king of Alasia demands that *Kasap ilani* be brought to him

by the Pharaoh of Egypt. This *Kasap ilani*, literally, "silver of the gods," is nothing more nor less than "the finest, or purest of silver." [1]

The participle *m^{e}raḥépheth* which follows immediately upon *rûaḥ* '^{e}*lōhîm* is frequently translated as "brooding," as though the spirit of God were hatching out a universe. But this figure is wholly foreign to both Babylonian and Hebrew representations of Creation. Nor does the usage of the root RḤP warrant such a rendering. It occurs in the Ḳal in Jer. xxiii. 9, where the text reads *nishbar libbî b^{e}kirbî rāḥ^{a}phû kol-'ac^{e}môthay*. With our verb parallel to *nishbar*, the lines must be rendered in some such way as this:

"My heart is broken within me,
All my bones are disjointed."

The common rendering "are shaken" may suffice. The only other uses of it are in Dt. xxxii. 11 and in Gen. i. 2. In Deuteronomy the picture is that of a vulture arousing its young to flight and hovering about them as they fly. The Greek rendering of *m^{e}raḥépheth* here is *epephereto*, which in classical Greek means "to rush at," "to attack," "strike"; a hostile attitude such as this characterises this verb in the active in Zech. ii. 9; Judith viii. 8; Mac. ii. 35, etc. In the passive, however, it occurs only in one other passage of the LXX.—viz., Gen. vii. 11—where *epephereto* representing the Hebrew *hālakh* describes the ark as "borne upon the surface of the water." The Targums all render *m^{e}raḥépheth* by some form of the root NSHB, "to blow." [2] This shows clearly, of course, that the thought of *rûaḥ* as "wind" lay in the background, even though they often render the word itself by "spirit." In all three of the passages in which the Hebrew verb appears some vigorous action is required. In Dt. it is the flapping or beating of the wings, in Jer. it is the shaking or dislocation of the bones, and in Gen. i. 2 it is the hard blowing

[1] See J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, No. 35, lines 19 and 20.

[2] Albright, *J.B.L.*, vol. xliii., p. 367, following Haupt, calls attention to the fact that the Arabic *raffa*, *rafrafa*, "quiver, flutter, beat wings" (of bird), is to be connected with the Hebrew RHP; but this is highly questionable.

of the wind. Bringing together these results, we obtain the following literal rendering of Gen. i. 1-3 :

" In the beginning, when God created the heavens and the earth, the earth having been a desolate waste, while darkness was upon the surface of the abyss and a mighty wind was beating upon the surface of the waters, then God said,

' Let there be light,'

And there was light."

T. H. Robinson's recent rendering in his translation of Gen. comes near to this in its use of " breath " rather than " spirit," and in the principle of the circumstantial clause being partly recognised, viz. :—

" When in the very beginning, God created the material universe, it was utter chaos, with darkness over the ocean and the breath of God hovering over the water. First, then God ordered, etc."

But this falls short in making a principal clause out of a circumstantial clause and in not frankly recognising *rûaḥ* as " wind."

The new American translation of the Old Testament which has just appeared presents the thought of this passage thus :—

" When God began to create the heavens and the earth, the earth being a desolate waste, with darkness covering the abyss and the spirit of God hovering over the waters, then God said, ' Let there be light ' ! And there was light, etc."

This treatment of the passage which we suggest does away with the quite generally accepted view that *bārā'* must mean *creatio ex nihilo*.[1] The circumstantial clause with the verb in the perfect rather represents the whole state pictured in vs. 2 as having existed prior to the creative activity first mentioned in vs. 3. God's first step in bringing order out of the pre-existing chaos was the introduction

[1] An article in *The Cambridge Journal of Philology*, xxix., pp. 263 *sqq.*, by Prof. Bevan brings out clearly the fact that *bārā'* does not mean *creatio ex nihilo*. This view is reinforced by the Arabic.

of light into the dark universe. The materials for his creation lay all ready to hand, but in a chaotic state; his great task was to bring order into that chaos. In this respect, therefore, as in others, the Hebrew account of creation went back to its Babylonian predecessor for its start. In the Babylonian story the first existing elements were Apsu and Tiamat, the fresh and salt water oceans respectively. These two were also thought of as primæval deities. From these watery gods the whole family of gods originated. In the course of time, strife broke out among the gods, and Apsu and Tiamat determined to wipe them out of existence. Panic-stricken they looked about for a deliverer, but none was found equal to the task until Marduk, the son of Ea, was summoned. He bravely faced Tiamat, and using cyclonic winds as his weapon, smote her to the earth and split her body into two portions, one of which "he set up and made into the heavens as a covering, and the other he made into the surface of the great deep."

The Hebrew narrative leaves all this conflict of the great gods out of consideration, and does not begin its account until Marduk has won his great victory and laid the foundations of the universe that is to be. But at the point where the Hebrew narrative starts in, the world was a mass of chaotic materials. It was like a great orchestra awaiting the appearance of the conductor. All the essential elements for the making of music are there; but what with the scraping of fiddles, the blowing of horns, and the contributions from bass-viols, drums, harps, piccolos, cellos, clarionets, fifes, and flutes, and each player blithely following his own will, the result is a chaos of sounds and a concatenation of discordant noise. When the conductor appears and lifts his baton, noise yields to harmony and chaos gives place to a concourse of sweet sounds. So at God's word light breaks upon the darkness and the various parts of the cosmic whole fall into place each in turn, and discord is banished by the symphony of creation. The self-restraint and dignity of the Hebrew narrative are in striking contrast with the crassness and puerility of its Babylonian forerunner. Here, as in many other places, the Hebrew mind shows the possession of a Midas-like touch that

transmuted everything with which it came in contact into the pure gold of the ethical and spiritual realm.

The first creative act of the deity in the making of this universe was the production of light. Even God himself could not work in the dark. This constituted the sum total of the first day's work. The differentiation between the watery chaos and the sky was the task of the second day: while the separation of dry land from the sea had to wait for the coming of the third day. Four days of the creative work were given to the work of building a world, equipping it with vegetation, and providing it with sun. moon, and stars. Not till the fifth day did animal life appear. This is much more intelligible when the creation narrative is understood as we have suggested, rather than in the more common interpretation. The narrative becomes self-consistent and progressive taken in this way, and does not retrace its steps. In the old way of treating the text the world was introduced as an existing fact in the first verse, only to be built up by degrees in the following narrative.

J. M. POWIS SMITH.

THE SOCIETY FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY.

THE EIGHTEENTH MEETING OF THE SOCIETY was held at Keble College, Oxford, from Tuesday, September 27th, to Friday, September 30th, 1927.

OFFICERS.

President: Rev. Dr. D. C. Simpson (Oxford).

Treas.: F. Braine Rockstro (London). *Sec.*: Rev. Dr. T. H. Robinson (Cardiff).

Committee: Prof. M. A. Canney (Manchester), Dr. S. A. Cook (Cambridge), Rev. B. M. Pickering (Rushmere), Rev. Principal H. Wheeler Robinson (London), Rev. Prof. W. B. Stevenson (Glasgow).

PROGRAMME.

TUESDAY, September 27th.

7.0 *p.m.* Dinner.

8.0 *p.m.* FIRST SESSION. Chairman: The President.

i. Address of Welcome by the President.

ii. Paper by the Rev. Principal H. Wheeler Robinson (London), "Prophetic Symbolism."

WEDNESDAY, September 28th.

8.30 *a.m.* Breakfast.

10.0 *a.m.* SECOND SESSION. Chairman: Rev. Dr. T. H. Robinson (Cardiff). Short Papers by:

i. G. R. Driver, M.A. (Oxford), "The Original Form of the Tetragrammaton."

ii. Prof. H. Th. Obbink (Utrecht), "The Tree of Life in Eden."

iii. Prof. P. Volz (Tübingen), "Der Gott des Mose."

12.45 *p.m.* A group-photograph of those attending the Meeting was taken in the Quadrangle of the College.

1.0 *p.m.* Lunch.

2.30 *p.m.* Visit to the University Printing Press, where Mr. John Johnson, the Printer to the University, entertained the Society and its guests to tea in the Quadrangle.

5.30 *p.m.* THIRD SESSION. Chairman: Prof. A. S. Peake (Manchester). Short Papers by:

i. Rev. Dr. G. A. Cooke (Oxford), "The Paradise Story of Ezekiel xxviii."

ii. Prof. J. Hempel (Greifswald, Editor of the *ZAW.*), "Der Frömmigkeitstypus der alttestamentlichen Religion."

7.30 *p.m.* Dinner.

8.30 *p.m.* FOURTH SESSION. Chairman: Rev. Dr. G. A. Cooke (Oxford). Paper by Prof. A. Lods (Paris), "Du rôle des idées magiques dans la mentalité israélite."

THURSDAY, September 29th.

8.30 *a.m.* Breakfast.

10.0 *a.m.* FIFTH SESSION. Chairman: Dr. S. A. Cook (Cambridge). Short Papers by:

i. Prof. B. D. Eerdmans (Leiden), "Deuteronomy."

ii. Prof. O. Eissfeldt (Halle), "Die kleinste literarische Einheit in den Erzählungen des Alten Testaments."

iii. Prof. A. A. Bevan (Cambridge), "Some Remarks on the *Historical Grammar of the Hebrew Language* by Bauer and Leander (Halle, 1922)."

1.0 *p.m.* Lunch.

2.30 *p.m.* Visits to the Bodleian, the Ashmolean, and places of interest in the neighbourhood of Oxford.

3.45 *p.m.* Tea at Oriel College.

5.30 *p.m.* Sixth Session. Chairman: Rev. Dr. W. B. Stevenson (Glasgow). Short Papers by:

i. Dr. S. A. Cook (Cambridge), "Archæology and the Religion of Israel."

ii. Prof. A. Causse (Strasbourg), "Le développement de la diaspora juive au V^e^ siécle."

7.30 *p.m.* Dinner.

8.30 *p.m.* Seventh Session. Chairman: Rev. Dr. G. H. Box (London). Paper by Prof. H. Gunkel (Halle), "A Re-investigation of the Chronology of the Psalms, in the light of Literary History."

FRIDAY, September 30th.

8.30 *a.m.* Breakfast.

10.0 *a.m.* Eighth Session. Chairman: The President. Short Papers by:

i. Prof. H. Schmidt (Giessen), "Die Gebete der Angeklagten im Alten Testament."

ii. Rev. Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley (London), "Israel and its Religious Environment."

iii. Prof. J. M. Powis Smith (Chicago), "The Syntax and Meaning of Gen. i. 1-3."

1.0 *p.m.* Lunch.

DATE DUE

Fac			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
0 0021 00183918

221.082
S678

Society for Old Testament Study.
AUTHOR

Old Testament essays.
TITLE

51134

221.082
S678 Society for Old Testament Study.
Old Testament essays.

51134